

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

LPA No.21 of 2018 (O&M) in  
CWP No.14842 of 2014  
Date of Decision:- 09.01.2018.

Haryana Public Service Commission

...Appellant

Versus

Baljit Singh and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.S. WALIA**

Present:- Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate for the appellant.

\*\*\*

**Rajesh Bindal, J.**

Interim order dated 09.11.2017, passed by learned Single Judge directing evaluation of the publications of respondent No.1 and for assigning the marks for the same for selection to the post of Research Officer/Planning Officer/Statistical Officer (Class-II) in the Department of Economic and Statistical Analysis, Government of Haryana, is under challenge.

The contentions raised are that the candidate having not produced the publications at the time of interview was not awarded any marks for the same. It is not in dispute that along with the applications submitted by the candidates, list of publications was annexed. It was further submitted that no malafide has been alleged against the members of the Interview Committee.

The learned Single Judge in the impugned order has opined that the selection was immediately challenged after the candidature of respondent No.1 was rejected and along with the writ petition he had annexed all the publications.

Hence, it cannot be presumed that these were not produced at the time of interview. Therefore, we do not find any error in the observations

made by the learned Single Judge in the order, whereby direction has been issued for evaluation of publications of respondent No.1 and to award marks, to which he may be entitled to.

At the time of hearing, learned counsel for the appellant pointed out that respondent No.5, in the writ petition, is not the last selected candidate, hence, comparison of respondent No.1, in the appeal, will not be with respondent No.5. However, he submitted that only respondent No.5, in the writ petition, had produced publications and no other candidates had produced any publications. It may be for this reason that comparison with respondent No.5, in the writ petition, was directed.

The Commission may now get the publications evaluated as marks upto 5 could be awarded for publications. In case, after the evaluation, respondent No.1, in the appeal, gets any marks for the publications, the result will be produced before the learned Single Judge, where the main writ petition is pending.

Learned counsel for the appellant further submitted that certified copy of the impugned order having been received on 19.12.2017, the papers published by respondent No.1 could not be evaluated. Some more time may be granted.

Needless to add that a party can always make such a prayer before the learned Single Judge, where the writ petition is pending.

Disposed of.

(Rajesh Bindal)  
Judge

(B.S. Walia)  
Judge

09.01.2018  
rajesh.k.khurana