

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

CWP No. 23080 of 2017

Date of decision : 24.10.2017

Anita Devi

...Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana & ors.

....Respondents

BEFORE : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. Ashok Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

RAJAN GUPTA J.

Petitioner has sought quashing of orders Annexures P-2, P-3 & P-4 passed by authorities under the Right to Information Act alleging that same have not been decided as per law. She urges that her request for supply of OMR sheet, marks obtained by her and the cut off marks prescribed under various categories have been wrongly rejected by the authorities. Learned counsel places reliance on judgment reported as *Kuldeep Singh vs. The Central Information Commission & ors. 2017(1) RCR (Civil) 293* in support of his contention. It appears that petitioner appeared for examination for selection for direct recruitment to the post of PGT(Hindi). The examination was conducted by Haryana Staff Selection Commission. Result of the written examination, which was objective in nature, was declared on 25.01.2017. Petitioner roll no did not figure in the list of candidates to be called for interview. She, thus, sought information aforesaid. Her plea has been rejected on the ground that recruitment process was still underway, thus, information about the marks obtained by her in the written test, OMR sheet etc. could not be furnished. I find no infirmity with

the order. In case candidate is allowed to seek information regarding marks obtained by her/him in written examination during ongoing process of selection, it would open flood gates of similar applications by other unsuccessful candidates. In such eventuality no selection would reach its completion. It would have the effect of delay in the selection process at its various stages. Entire objective of conducting a selection to fill up the vacant posts would be defeated. Judgment in *Kuldeep Singh* 's case (supra) is not applicable to the facts of the instant case. Thus, no ground to interfere in writ jurisdiction is made out. Dismissed.

October 24, 2017

Ajay

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No