



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>WPSB/619/2024</u> <u>Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.</u> <u>Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.</u> 1. Mr. Vinod Tiwari, learned counsel for the petitioner. 2. Ms. Menka Tripathi, learned counsel for the respondent-Selecting Body. 3. Petitioner participated in a selection for appointment to the post of Assistant Professor in Government Degree Colleges. Her candidature was rejected on the ground that she did not submit her educational certificate along with her application and she was given opportunity to furnish requisite documents, however, she could not submit the documents, even within the extended time. 4. By means of this writ petition, petitioner has sought the following reliefs:- (i) to issue writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari to quash the Candidature Rejection List dated 13th August 2024 issued by the respondent (Annexure No. 5) so far it relates to the rejection of the candidature of the petitioner (Roll No. 504362) on the ground of delayed submission of the documents. (ii) to issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding and directing the respondent to call the petitioner for the interview of Assistant Professor-Sanskrit scheduled to be held on 04.10.2024 by accepting her documents in support of her claim made on online application which has been submitted to the respondent before publication of the Candidature Rejection List.



			5. This Court vide order dated 01.10.2024 had directed Uttarakhand Public Service Commission to provisionally permit petitioner to participate in the interview, which was scheduled to be held from 04.10.2024, and it was further provided that her result shall not be declared without leave of this Court. 6. Pursuant to that order, petitioner participated in the interview, however, her result was not declared on account of condition put by this Court in its order. 7. On 24.04.2026, when this fact was brought to notice of this Court, then we directed the counsel for the Selecting Body to produce the result of the petitioner in a sealed cover. In terms of said direction, Ms. Menka Tripathi, learned counsel appearing for the Selecting Body has produced the result of the petitioner, along with other candidates, in a sealed envelope, which was opened in the presence of learned counsel for the parties. 8. Perusal of the result, it is revealed that petitioner scored only 25.25 marks out of 100 marks. Thus, her score was less than 26 percent. 9. Learned counsel for the Selecting Body points out that the cut-off marks fixed for general category candidate is 45 percent. 10. Learned counsel for the petitioner concedes this position and submits that minimum 45 percent marks have to be secured by a general category candidate to be declared as successful.
--	--	--	--



			11. Since petitioner's score is much less than what is required, therefore, there cannot be any direction to the Selecting Body to recommend the name of the petitioner for appointment. Thus, without going into the other issues raised by the petitioner, which are now become of academic interest only, the writ petition is dismissed. 12. The result of the selection in question is resealed and handed over to Ms. Menka Tripathi, learned counsel for the Selecting Body. (Pankaj Purohit, J.) (Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.) 12.06.2026 <i>Aswal</i> NETI BAL/SONOY ASWAL
--	--	--	---