



IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA

AND

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE MR. SUBHASH UPADHYAY

Writ Petition (S/B) No.294 of 2026

15th July, 2026

Sagri Singh

-----Petitioner

Versus

State of Uttarakhand and Another

----Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. Abhijay Negi and Ms. Snigdha Tiwari, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Mr. Gajendra Tripathi, learned Standing Counsel for the State of Uttarakhand.

Mr. Pankaj Miglani, Learned counsel for the UKPSC/ respondent no.2.

JUDGMENT: (per Mr. Manoj Kumar Gupta C. J.)

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. The present writ petition has been filed praying for a writ of mandamus commanding the respondent-Uttarakhand Public Service Commission to hold a separate computer practical examination for the petitioner for the recruitment on the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division).
3. The facts of the case are that the petitioner participated in the recruitment process for the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) on the basis of the advertisement dated 16.05.2025. She succeeded in qualifying the



preliminary examination. The main examination comprised of five written examination and one practical examination.

4. The petitioner appeared in the written examination held between 21.04.2026 and 23.04.2026, however, she could not appear in the practical examination held on 24.04.2026 between 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. The practical examination was for adjudging basic knowledge for computer operation. It was of a qualifying nature which a candidate had to pass, to enable him /her to proceed to the next stage i.e. interview.

5. The case of the petitioner is that on the date of practical examination she reported at the examination centre approximately 15 minutes late from the scheduled reported time due to certain unavoidable medical emergency. She had filed a medical prescription which is dated 24.04.2026 and which records that since last three days she was showing signs of dehydration.

6. As the Commission has refused to hold separate practical examination of computers for the petitioner, therefore, the present writ petition has been filed.

7. The Commission has filed a counter affidavit and the stand taken is that passing the computer examination was one of the mandatory requirements of the selection



process. It is stated that the practical examination, though of a qualifying in nature, had to be cleared by a candidate, failing which, he/she would not be entitled to progress to the next stage i.e. interview. It is also stated that the Commission has to abide by the timelines notified and it cannot change the same based on the individual needs nor can be compelled to hold a separate examination.

8. The representation of the petitioner for holding a separate examination has also been considered by the Commission. The Commission has rejected the representation by order dated 19.05.2026. The order records that as per CCTV footage, the petitioner reported at the examination centre at 11:29 a.m., much after the exam had started at 11:00 a.m.

9. The Admit Card contains the following instructions—

“Instruction No.4 –Candidate will be allowed to enter in the examination center/hall 20 minutes before the commencement of the examination. OMR Attendance Sheet will be provided 10 minutes before the commencement of the examination.

Instruction No.05- No candidate shall be allowed to enter in the examination hall after commencement of the examination.”

Instruction No.14- Presence of candidates will be videographed at the examination centre for which the candidate must reach the centre 1:30 hours before the scheduled examination time.”



10. It is not disputed before us that the practical examination has to be cleared for moving to the next stage of the recruitment process, which is interview.

11. The Commission, in view of the fact that the petitioner had failed to appear in the practical examination, has not even examined the answer books of the five written examinations.

12. The result of the written examination in respect of other candidates who have appeared in all the papers has already been declared wherein for the reasons stated above, the name of the petitioner does not figure.

13. As passing the practical examination was a mandatory condition of the selection process and the petitioner has failed to appear in the practical examination, therefore, we cannot find any fault in the stand of the Commission in declining to permit the petitioner to move to the next date of the recruitment process.

14. The instructions in the admit card that a candidate had to report at examination centre 20 minutes before the commencement of examination was well-known to the petitioner. Although this Court has every sympathy



with the petitioner, but directing the Commission to hold a separate examination for the petitioner would result in setting a wrong precedent and other complications.

15. In such circumstances, we decline the relief claimed. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

16. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA, C. J.)

(SUBHASH UPADHYAY, J.)

Dated: 15.07.2026

SS