

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

**CWP No.10698 of 2016
Date of decision: 26.5.2016**

Sashi Bala & ors. ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & ors. ... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Vishal Mittal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

1. This petition is squarely covered by the decision of this Court delivered in CWP No.25794 of 2015 (Ekta Sharma & ors. vs. State of Punjab & ors.) and 25 connected petitions, decided on 18.5.2016, in which the following order was passed:-

“This order will dispose of the above captioned petitions since the point involved in them is the same and the 26 petitions can be disposed of by a common order.

Heard counsel.

These petitions without doubt are covered by the decision of this Court in LPA No. 1064 of 2015, “State of Punjab & Anr. Vs. Kulwinder Kaur & Ors.”, arising out of the orders of learned Single Bench dated 05.09.2014 passed in C.W.P No. 2461 of 2012 and connected cases wherein directions have been issued to State of Punjab to give the petitioners the benefit of four marks of which the answer keys were found wrong. The mistakes have been held to the advantage of the candidates who appeared for the test to secure them success in the result.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that the duration of validity and active life of Punjab State Teacher

Eligibility Test (PSTET) for purposes of seeking public employment is 07 years and in the event of success of the petition, the result of the PSTET will hold good till July, 2018, as per Annex P/12.

Since relief has been given by the learned Single Judge and appeal filed by the State has been declined, the petitioners would be entitled to the same benefits as was accorded to the respondent in the Letters Patent Appeal. This would however be subject to the petitioners having attempted the four identified questions as were subject matter of the judgments and orders of this Court in the aforesaid litigation.

In view of the above, the petitions are allowed subject to the above-mentioned condition being satisfied.”

2. Since the position is settled, there is no need to put the State to notice in a covered matter. This petition is allowed in the same terms and subject to the same conditions as contained in the aforementioned order passed in CWP No.25794 of 2015.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

26.5.2016
monika