

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****Date of decision: 14.03.2018****CWP No.4299 of 2015**

Manju Bala

...Petitioner

Vs.

Additional Deputy Commissioner -cum- Chairman of Selection Committee
for Anganwari Workers, District Kaithal, Women and Child Development
Department, Haryana & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. J.P.Dhull, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Joginder Singh Duhan, Advocate,
for respondent No.3.

Mr. Ramesh Chahal & Ms. Rajwinder Kaur, Advocates,
for respondent No.4.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (ORAL)

The disputed figure '6' in the result sheet of Sunita Devi, the 4th respondent, has been examined by the Central Forensic Science Laboratory, Chandigarh. In the report bearing No.CFSL/(C)-310/2018/DOC/CX-56/2018-2649 dated 26.02.2018/08.03.2018, the following is the result of examination:

"1. On scientific examination of the writings (figures) in the enclosed portion stamped and marked Q1

under various light arrangement such as:- incident light, oblique light, transmitted light, ultra violet rays, Infra red rays using various scientific instruments such as – Docucentre expert, stereomicroscope and lenses of different magnifications the following observations are made-

- i) There are presence of additional strokes in the existing figure '6' in the enclosed portion marked Q1, but it has not been possible to decipher the original figure, if any, below the existing figure '6' on the available instruments in the laboratory.”

If it is not possible to decipher the original figure, if any, below existing figure '6' on and by the available instruments in the laboratory, it would be totally unfair to quash the appointment of Sunita Devi as Anganwari Worker on a mere suspicion. The difference of marks secured by the petitioner i.e. 72 and of the selected candidates, namely, Sunita Rani and Munia i.e. 74 & 75 marks respectively, is not a matter which disturbs the conscience of the Court. It would be highly dangerous to consider upsetting the selection of the private respondents. Thus, I find that no ground for interference is made out and would dismiss the petition.

Photocopies of three sheets containing the result are retained on record, while the report of the CFSL is made part of this file as Mark – 'A'.

14.03.2018
Vimal

[RAJIV NARAIN RAINA]
JUDGE

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