

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

**Civil Writ Petition No.4762 of 2017
Date of Decision: 14.03.2017**

Sapna Rani and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

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

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

Six petitioners, namely, Sapna Rani, Nisha Goyal, Satvir Kaur Washist, Rupinder Kaur, Jagdish and Sanjeev Kumar had undertaken the Punjab State Teachers Eligibility Test (PSTET-II) conducted on 03.07.2011 for the purpose of seeking employment with the Education Department. In the event, a candidate passes the test, the result stands good for seven years i.e. till July 2018.

The claim of the petitioners is that they had attempted four/three/two questions, respectively, whose answer keys were subsequently found incorrect by this Court, as also by the Committee, vide its report/justification dated 12.10.2015 (**Annexure P-3**). Therefore, petitioner Nos.1 & 2 are entitled to grant of 03 additional marks; petitioner Nos.3 to 5 are entitled to grant of 04 additional marks & petitioner No.6 is entitled to grant of 02 additional marks. They also claim that their PSTET-II result may be revised accordingly.

Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the issue raised in the present petition stands decided in a bunch of petitions, decided on 18.05.2016 (**Annexure P-4**) by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in **CWP No.25794 of 2015**, titled “**Ekta Sharma and others Vs. State of Punjab and others**”. He further submits that the matter is also squarely covered by the judgment of this Court passed in **CWP No.24214 of 2016** titled as “**Ranjit Kaur and others Vs. State of Punjab and others, decided on 23.11.2016**”. Thus, relief is claimed in the light of aforesaid decisions.

On the asking of Court, Mz. Sudeepti Sharma, Deputy Advocate General Punjab, on instructions from Supdt., O/o Director, SCERT, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

Learned Counsel for the petitioners has furnished the copy of writ petition to the Counsel opposite.

Learned State Counsel very fairly concedes that the present writ petition is liable to be disposed of in view of the above decisions dated 18.05.2016 (**P-4**) and 23.11.2016.

In view of the aforesaid stand, the present petition is allowed in the same terms as passed in the aforesaid judgments dated 18.05.2016 (**P-4**) and 23.11.2016.

March 14, 2017
Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>