

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

LPA-282-2015

Date of Decision: March 2, 2015

Surjan Singh

...Appellant

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI**

Present: Ms. Ankur Berri, Advocate,  
for Mr. Gaurav Mohunta, Advocate,  
for the appellant.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

**SURYA KANT, J. (Oral)**

The order dated 13.11.2014, whereby learned Single Judge has declined to interfere in a matter pertaining to re-evaluation of certain questions in a competitive examination, after the exercise undertaken by a committee of experts, has given rise to the instant Letters Patent Appeal.

The appellant competed for the post of Assistant Engineer (OT), Electronics and Communication and was placed at 7<sup>th</sup> rank with 62.25 marks. There were only five posts meant for

General category to which he belongs. It appears that bunch of writ petitions were filed questioning the answer keys in respect of Question Nos. 7, 25, 38, 42, 48, 56, 57 and 67. The appellant was one of the writ petitioner in CWP No. 3438 of 2014. Those writ petitions were disposed of with a direction to the respondents to have the answer keys re-examined by a panel of three experts in the light of the material placed on record by the writ petitioners.

The committee of three experts, thus, re-considered the answer keys of aforementioned questions and on re-evaluation of the answers pertaining to some of the questions, the appellant's marks stood increased from 62.25 to 64.75. The appellant could not still make it to the first five in open category. Thereafter, he filed the second writ petition questioning the correctness of the answer key of question No. 7 in Booklet Series 'A', as according to him option 'A' was the correct answer and not option 'B'. He, thus, contended that he should be given marks for the said question also so that his total marks would increase more than some of the selected candidates.

Learned Single Judge has declined to entertain the above stated challenge observing that the result has already been re-evaluated by a panel of three experts under the direction of this Court.

We have heard learned counsel for the appellant. It is a conceded fact that question No. 7 was also subject matter of re-examination by the experts. In these circumstances, it is difficult for us to interfere in the matter, except to say that if there is any substance in the appellant's claim that option 'A' ought to be the correct answer, he may approach the said experts along with the material.

Disposed of accordingly.

**(SURYA KANT)  
JUDGE**

**(NARESH KUMAR SANGHI)  
JUDGE**

**March 2, 2015**  
Pkapoor