

- **Appellants must disclose at the time of application all the experience that they claim they have concerning the post.**
- **If the Scheme of Service requires a number of years of experience, the experience claimed must be relevant to the duties of the post.**

1. This is an appeal against the decision of the Respondent following an offer of appointment by selection made to the Co-Respondents to the post of REGO in a temporary capacity. The complaint of the Appellant is that he was not called for an interview for the post despite (i) holding a Honours degrees in the relevant field from the University of Mauritius and (ii) having 4 years' experience.
2. Appellant was not assisted by Counsel. We however explained to him the procedure which applies before the Public Bodies Appeal Tribunal, *inter alia*, of his right to call witnesses, cross-examine witnesses called on behalf of the Respondent and to cross-examine Co-Respondents No. 3 and 4 who submitted and affirmed to the correctness of their respective Statements of Defence. Appellant was also informed of his right to submit any documentary evidence in support of his case.

Case for the Appellant

3. It was the case for the Appellant that he satisfied the qualifications for the post, in particular that he met the requirement of a minimum of ... years' experience in the relevant field. He mentioned in his Statement of Case that he was the beneficiary of a scholarship from the ... He also added that he was involved in the ... Programme, under the aegis of the Ministry of He further stated that he was engaged as a volunteer in ...
4. In cross-examination the Appellant agreed that he never mentioned all these details in his SOC submitted to the Respondent. As regards the scholarship the Appellant obtained from the ..., it was one to allow him to pursue studies in The Appellant, who had spent some 15 years in the POLF, did not dispute the fact that he was appointed as a CBO in The Appellant's contention is that his time spent in the POLF should be reckoned when calculating the number of years of experience he has in the relevant field. He also contends that experience acquired in the private sector must be taken into account.

Case for the Respondent

5. It was the case for the Respondent that the Appellant did not reckon 4 years' experience in the relevant field which was one of the eligibility criteria. According to the Respondent, the Appellant reckoned only 2 years' experience and never mentioned any of the experience he stated in his Statement of Case in his application form. In cross-examination, the Appellant agreed that this was the case. The Respondent did not consider the Appellant's experience acquired in the POLF because his duties were enforcement duties and were not relevant to the post.

Determination

6. The Respondent considered the Appellant's application on the basis of information provided on the application form. The Appellant having failed to disclose on his application form the experience he allegedly had in various activities, he cannot now complain that he had the minimum of 4 years' experience as required for the post and therefore ought to have been called for an interview for the post concerned. Furthermore, we do not agree with the Appellant that his experience in the POLF should have been taken into account when determining whether he has the minimum 4 years' experience in the relevant field. We are of the view that an Officer of the POLF who acts as a neighbourhood officer does not act in the relevant field. In any event, the Appellant did not explain the nature of work he was doing as a 'neighbourhood officer' and did not challenge the evidence adduced by the witnesses for the Respondent.
7. For the above reasons, the appeal is set aside.