

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-9412-2017

Date of decision : 31.10.2017

Ajay Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Dalbir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.K.Doon, AAG, Haryana.

Mr.Kanwal Goyal, Advocate
for respondents no.3 & 4-Commission.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Though learned counsel for the petitioner has very vehemently tried to show before this Court that the answers given in the research material relied upon by him, are different to the answers given in the answer key supplied to the Commission by an expert body, (the petitioner raising a doubt on the correctness of question no.1 itself), however, upon the matter having been referred to an Expert Committee by the Commission itself, on the basis of whose report 9 questions were deleted, I see no reason to interfere in the selection process, the Expert Committee also having been shown today by learned counsel for the respondent Commission, to be consisting of Professors of different Life Sciences.

In specific reference to question no.1, the issue is as to whether a Hydrogen Bond or Hydrophobic interaction play a stabilizing role in the

petitioner and learned counsel for the Commission, in my opinion it could be interpreted either ways, and therefore, with an expert committee having gone into that issue, I find myself unable to interfere in the matter.

The other questions on which learned counsel for the petitioner has raised a doubt have not been even gone into by this Court, it not being competent to go into the details of zoological principles, or the basis of various answers to questions relating to zoology. Had the matter been of a very commonly understood subject such as History / Geography /Social Studies etc., possibly this Court may have gone deeper into the issue depending upon the nature of the questions shown to be answered wrongly, as was in the case of a selection process pertaining to Assistant Professors of Geography. In that case the answer to a basic question, answerable by even a Class III or Class IV student, was found to have been wrongly given in the answer key, by this Court. That not being so in the present case, I find it inappropriate to interfere in the matter.

Dismissed.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

October 31, 2017.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No