

CWP No.256 of 2018

[1]

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

**CWP No.256 of 2018
Date of decision:11.01.2018**

Sanjay Sharma and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. Anurag Goyal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

The petitioners have challenged the answer key to question nos.50, 53, 69, 71 and 74 of the written examination held for screening/short listing the candidates for the post of PGT Sanskrit.

In brief, the Haryana Staff Selection Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "HSSC") issued advertisement No.4/2015 on 28.06.2015 to invite applications for direct recruitment to 6874 posts of (PGT)-HES-II (Group-B Services) including 626 posts of PGT-Sanskrit. As per the special instructions provided in the aforesaid advertisement, the prescribed essential qualification was not enough for a candidate to call for the interview as the Commission had reserved its right to short list the candidates for the interview by holding a written examination. Accordingly, the written examination was held in the form of multi-choice question papers of 160 marks having two marks for each question without any negative marking. The result of the aforesaid examination was declared and answer key was uploaded accordingly.

The petitioners were not satisfied with the answer keys as, according to them, the answer key of the aforesaid five questions was incorrect and, therefore, they submitted their objections immediately against the correctness of the answer to the said questions. Thereafter, the Commission uploaded the revised answer key on its website on 08/09.12.2017. The petitioners had again submitted objections/representation and has approached this Court that there are errors in the answer keys of the aforesaid five questions and, therefore, the same may be quashed and the HSSC may be directed to constitute the Committee of subject experts to evaluate the answer key of the aforesaid five questions before finalizing the result.

Counsel for the petitioners has vehemently reiterated the stand taken in the writ petition but in view of the fact that the petitioners have already availed the remedy of filing objection to the answer key, which was initially uploaded on the website of the Commission and after considering their objections, the revised answer key has been uploaded, they cannot be allowed to file objections again and again to the answer key by referring to some literature on the subject because in that eventuality, it would be an unending process and the sanctity of the examination would be seriously effected.

Thus, in my considered opinion, there is hardly any merit in this petition for the purpose of interference by this Court. Hence, the same is hereby dismissed, though without any order as to costs.

January 11, 2018
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No