

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA
CWP No.890 of 2026
Decided on 25th June, 2026

Kashmir Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others

...Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge

¹Whether approved for reporting?

For the petitioner: Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate.

**For the respondents: Mr. Pushpinder Jaswal, Additional
Advocate General, for respondent
No.1.**

**M/s Vikrant Thakur and Shubham
Singh Guleria, Advocate, for
respondent No.2.**

Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge (Oral)

By way of this writ petition, the petitioner has, *inter alia*, prayed for the following reliefs:-

- "i) *Kindly call for the records of the case and issue appropriate writ, orders or directions, in favour of the petitioner and the respondents may kindly be directed to grant 9 additional marks to the petitioner in respect of answer given to question No.1(b) of Paper-1 as initially given and 10 marks in respect of the answers given to question No.6(b) as against 4 and thereafter to re-draw the entire merit/select list and the petitioner be included in the merit/select list in place of respondent No.3.*
- ii) *That the answer sheets of the petitioner for Paper-1 of the Mains Examination may kindly be called.*

iii) *That the respondents be directed to re-draw the entire merit/select list and the petitioner be included in the same."*

2. When this case was listed on 17.06.2026, the following order was passed:-

"Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner will be confining his case only to question No.6(b) of paper-1 of the main examination. He submits that this question comprised of five sub-parts, whereas, the petitioner attempted all the five parts and his answers were marked as correct answers by the examiner, yet, no mark has been allotted to him by the examiner in respect of three sub-parts.

In order to examine this aspect of the matter as to whether qua three sub-parts of question No.6(b), the petitioner has been denied marks despite the answers attempted by the petitioner having been found to be correct answers by the examiner, Commission is directed to produce the original paper-1 of the petitioner of the main examination in a sealed cover for the perusal of this Court. This of course will be subject to deposition of an amount of Rs.10,000/- by the petitioner with the Registry of this Court by 22.06.2026. In case, the said amount is deposited by the petitioner with the Registry of this Court, then, the answer sheet be produced for the perusal of the Court on 25.06.2026."

3. In compliance thereto, today the answer sheet of the petitioner in original has been produced before the Court in a sealed cover. The sealed cover was open and the answer was perused by the Court. Perusal thereof demonstrates that as far as question No.6(b) is concerned, the same consisted of five sub-parts. But, the contention of the petitioner that despite

the answers attempted by him found correct for all the sub-parts, he was given marks only for two sub-parts and he was not given any marks for three other sub-parts, is not correct. In terms of the answer sheet, three of the sub answers given to question No.6(b) were found to be incorrect. Two were found to be correct and qua them the marks have been given and same been taken into count as far as the final marks granted to the petitioner.

4. In the backdrop of this, as the petitioner cannot be granted any relief as is being prayed for, these proceedings are closed. The answer sheet of the petitioner is re-sealed and returned back to the learned counsel appearing for the respondent. Out of the amount of Rs.10,000/- which was deposited by the petitioner with the Registry of this Court, let an amount of Rs.5,000/- be released back to the petitioner and 5,000/- shall be paid to the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

June 25, 2026
(*Vinod*)