

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.11695 of 2016

Date of Decision: 02.06.2016

Taranjeet Kaur and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Jitender Singh Dadwal, 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.

Contends that the matter is covered by the decision in CWP
No.25794 of 2015 and 25 connected writ petitions decided on May 18, 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.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that a public notice has been issued in the newspapers extending the date to apply for the post of Masters in the Education Department till June 15, 2016 to accommodate the petitioners in the aforesaid writ petitions. Since the date has been extended the petitioners should also be permitted to apply for the post as they are similarly situated as the petitioners are in the aforesaid writ petitions with the qualification as imposed in the aforesaid petitions that the application would be subject to the petitioners having attempted the four identified questions as were subject matter of the judgments and orders of this Court to the litigation mentioned in the order dated May 18, 2016.

A photocopy of the public notice in the newspapers produced in court at the hearing to show the extended date is June 15, 2016 is retained on record and is accepted as correct on the statement of the counsel at the Bar.

Since the matter has already been decided and the petitioners' case is identical, there is no need to issue notice to the State to pass the same

order therefore this petition is disposed of in terms of the orders passed in the cases (supra).

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

02.06.2016
manju