

**HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**LPA No.971 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.07.2015**

Parminder Singh

... Appellant

VS.

Punjab State Power Corp.Ltd. & Anr.

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI**

Present: Mr. Satbir Gill, Advocate for the appellant

SURYA KANT, J. (Oral)

(1) This Letters Patent Appeal assails the order dated 25.11.2013 whereby learned Single Judge has disposed of a bunch of writ petitions questioning the answer key of the examination conducted by the respondent-Corporation for recruitment to the post of Junior Engineer (Electrical). The appellant is also aggrieved by the order dated 05.03.2014 dismissing his review application. There is an application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act seeking condonation of delay of 523 days in filing the accompanying appeal.

(2) Keeping in view the plea that it was the last chance for the appellant to compete for public employment, that we have heard his learned counsel on merits instead of dismissing the appeal being barred by limitation and/or his failure to explain the inordinate delay.

(3) It is not in dispute that in the writ petitions primarily the answer key of three questions was doubted for which the learned Single Judge referred the matter to an expert Committee to re-

appraise those three questions only. At the same time with a view to afford opportunity to all the affected candidates, a public notice was also directed to be issued on the website informing that no other question would be entertained apart from those indicated in the petition(s).

(4) The grievance of the appellant appears to be against question No.80 in Paper-I Test Code: DEV/2009/J for which he never agitated before the expert committee despite an opportunity given through public notice.

(5) The order passed by learned Single Judge further reveals that answer to one of the questions remained doubtful at the time of adjudication of the writ petitions also hence one grace mark was given to each candidate who had attempted that question. Unfortunately, despite that grace mark the appellant's total marks remained 61 as against the requirement of 62.

(6) The appellant, at this belated stage, seeks interference in the evaluation process and wants question No.80 be also referred to the Expert Committee. We do not find any valid ground to do so.

(7) Dismissed.

(Surya Kant)
Judge

06.07.2015
vishal shonkar

(P.B. Bajanthri)
Judge