

CWP-17420-2013

1

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

Date of Decision : 19.4.2017

CWP-17420-2013

DR.SATISH KUMAR DHULL

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

..... Respondents

CWP-3434-2014 (O&M)

RAVINDER KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Vikram Punia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. R.K.Malik, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Tej Pal Singh Dhull, Advocate
for respondents No. 4, 14 to 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 29, 31, 34,35
and 43.(CWP-17420-2013)

Mr.Nihul Pratap Singh, Advocate
for respondent No. 20.

Mr. Sandeep Singh, Advocate
for respondent No. 35.

Mr. H.N.Mehtani, Advocate for
respondent No.-45-HPSC.(CWP-17420-2013)

Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate
for respondent No. 2-HPSC (CWP-3434-2014)

Mr. B.B.Bagga, Advocate
for respondent No. 5.((CWP-3434-2014))

Mr. Charanjit Lal, Advocate
for respondents No. 8 to 10, 12, 25, 37 to 40 and 47.
(CWP-3434-2014)

Mr. Amit Kashyap, Advocate for
Mr. Rajinder Goyal, Advocate
for respondent No. 13.(CWP-3434-2014)

Mr. S.P.Chahar, Advocate
for respondent No. 46.(CWP-3434-2014)

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

By this petition the petitioner is challenging the selection process of Assistant Professors (College Cadre), HES-II- Group-B in the subject of English of the General category pursuant to the advertisement No. 7 dated. 28.10.2009.

The main ground taken is that allocation of 60% marks for interview are too excessive. There is no allegation that any of the selected candidates had any access to the member of any selection committee or that any person has been given marks in the interview for extraneous consideration. The allegation only is that the prescription of 60% marks carries a potential for mischief, in so much as persons who may be far below in the objective criteria can be brought up artificially.

In my opinion this argument raised, as it is in a vacuum, cannot suffice. There is no golden rule as to what should be the proportion of marks between the objective and subjective parts of the selection process. In some cases Courts have held that interview marks beyond 20% are

CWP-17420-2013

3

excessive and in other cases even 100% marks for interview have been upheld.

In the circumstances, this bald allegation only on the potential of mischief cannot be accepted.

Petition stands dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending Civil Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

19.04.2017
anuradha

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned - Yes/No

Whether reportable - Yes/No