



2026:UHC:4584-DB

IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND
AT NAINITAL

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SHRI MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA
AND

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUBHASH UPADHYAY

09TH JUNE, 2026

SPECIAL APPEAL No. 154 OF 2026

Km. Rashmi Rawat.

...Appellant

Versus

State of Uttarakhand and others.

...Respondents

Counsel for the appellant. : Mr. C.S. Rawat and Mr. Vivek Kumar,
learned counsel.

Counsel for respondent nos. 1 & 2. : Mr. B.P.S. Mer, learned Standing Counsel
with Mr. M.S. Bisht, learned Brief Holder
for the State of Uttarakhand.

Counsel for respondent no. 3. : Mr. Shailendra Nauriyal, learned counsel.

JUDGMENT : (per Shri Manoj Kumar Gupta, C.J.)

1. The present intra-court appeal is directed against the order of learned Single Judge dated 28.04.2026 passed in Writ Petition (S/S) No. 1108/2026, whereby the writ petition filed by the appellant-writ petitioner, seeking quashing of the order dated 30.09.2025, by which her representation for giving her another opportunity for document verification in the recruitment process for the post of Deputy Librarian was rejected, has been dismissed.

2. The case of the appellant was that she was declared successful in the written examination and, thereafter, the process of document verification was undertaken by the



Commission on 10.06.2025, on basis of a notice published by it on 05.06.2025 on its official website, which was not in the knowledge of the appellant and, therefore, she could not appear in the said process of document verification. The Commission rejected the candidature of the appellant because she could not appear at the stage of document verification for lack of proper intimation. She made a representation for giving her one more opportunity to appear for document verification, but the said representation was also rejected. The same was assailed before the Writ Court. The Writ Court has dismissed the writ petition by observing that, under the advertisement, the necessary information was to be furnished by the Selecting Body to the candidates by e-mail, SMS or by uploading the information on the official website. The Commission had uploaded the information regarding the date, on which document verification was to be held, and in case the appellant, despite the aforesaid step taken by the Commission, did not appear in the document verification, then she has to blame herself, and the Commission cannot be faulted for that. Accordingly, the writ petition has been dismissed.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that, as per Clause 03 of the advertisement, important information was to be furnished to the candidates by the Selecting Body by uploading the information on its website, e-mail or SMS.



According to him, apart from uploading the information on website, the Commission was also required to inform the candidates, either through e-mail or SMS. In the instant case, since the information was only uploaded on website, and not given through e-mail or SMS, therefore, the learned Single Judge erred in dismissing the writ petition. Learned counsel for the appellant has also placed reliance on Clause 16(12) of the advertisement in support of his submission.

4. Under the recruitment scheme, as per Clause 02, applications were to be submitted only through online mode on the official website, i.e. www.sssc.uk.gov.in by 04.01.2025. Under Clause 03, the Commission had the option to conduct the examination by offline or online mode. The further provision in the said clause is that the date for submitting the application form, as notified, is final. In case there is any change in the date, the same would be notified separately on the website and through newspapers, as well as on mobile number and e-mail. However, the admission cards were to be downloaded by the candidates from the official website. The same would not be sent to them in hardcopies. The further stipulation is that the important information would be provided to the candidates by the Commission through its website, e-mail or SMS. Thus, there were three alternative modes, which were available, namely intimation through website, or e-mail, or SMS.



5. The contention that the intimation, apart from uploading the same on the website, was to be supplied by e-mail, or through SMS as well, is a clear misreading. The use of 'comma' and 'or' evidences that the three modes are alternative and not cumulative. The relevant Clause is extracted below for ready reference :-

“03. अभ्यर्थियों के चयन हेतु आयोग द्वारा वस्तुनिष्ठ प्रकार की Offline अथवा Online mode में प्रतियोगी परीक्षा आयोजित कराई जाएगी। प्रतियोगी परीक्षा के संबंध में प्रथम पैरा में दी गई तिथि अनन्तिम है। परीक्षा की तिथि की संशोधित सूचना यथा समय पृथक् के आयोग की वेबसाइट, दैनिक समाचार पत्रों में प्रेस विज्ञप्ति तथा अभ्यर्थियों को उनके द्वारा ऑनलाइन आवेदन-पत्र में दिये गये Mobile Phone Number पर S.M.S. तथा E-Mail द्वारा भी उपलब्ध करायी जाएगी। अभ्यर्थी अपने प्रवेश पत्र आयोग की वेबसाइट से डाउनलोड कर सकेंगे। आयोग द्वारा डाक के माध्यम से प्रवेश पत्र निर्गत नहीं किए जाएंगे। अभ्यर्थियों को महत्वपूर्ण सूचनाएं भी आयोग की वेबसाइट, E-Mail या S.M.S. से ही मिलेंगी। इसलिए अभ्यर्थी आवेदन पत्र में स्वयं का सही Phone / Mobile Number व E-Mail भरें। आयोग द्वारा सभी सूचनाएं आयोग की वेबसाइट पर प्रकाशित की जाएंगी। अतः आवश्यक है, कि अभ्यर्थी चयन प्रक्रिया के संबंध में जानकारी यथा परीक्षा कार्यक्रम, प्रवेश पत्र जारी करना इत्यादि के लिए आयोग की वेबसाइट www.sssc.uk.gov.in को समय-समय पर देखते रहें।”

(emphasis supplied)

6. The learned Single Judge has rightly observed that, in case intimation has been given by any of the aforesaid three modes, that was sufficient.

7. Learned counsel for the Commission has placed on record the instructions received from the Secretary, and according to which, in all, 11 candidates were called for document verification, out of which, except the appellant, all other had appeared in the document verification. It is thus evident that the instructions of the Commission were clear, and all other candidates had duly appeared for document



verification, only on basis of the information uploaded by the Commission on its website.

8. As regards reliance placed on Clause 16(12), we find that the same relates to issuance of admission cards through the official website, and for which intimation was to be given to the candidates on the official website, as well as by press note. Since, in the instant case, the dispute is not regarding the intimation given to the candidates for downloading their admission cards, but for appearing in the document verification, the said clause would not apply.

9. Learned counsel for the appellant has also placed reliance on a notification dated 05.06.2025, which, according to him, was duly prepared by the Commission for publication in the newspapers, but was not published anywhere.

10. The said contention also does not have any force, inasmuch as, the relevant information regarding the date fixed for document verification was duly uploaded by the Commission on its official website, and it was on basis of the same that all other candidates, except the appellant, participated in the process of document verification.

11. As per instructions furnished by the Commission, recommendation for appointment against all 08 vacancies has



already been made by the Commission to the State Government.

12. In view of the above, we find no good ground to interfere with the order of learned Single Judge. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

13. All pending applications stand disposed of accordingly.

MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA, C.J.

SUBHASH UPADHYAY, J.

Dt: 09th June, 2026
Rahul

RAHUL
PRAJAPATI