

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

109

**CWP-31800-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 13.11.2019**

Tanvi Kalra

... Petitioner

Versus

Registrar General, Punjab and Haryana, High Court and another

...Respondents

**CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL**

Present: Mr. Sourabh Bedi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajeev Anand, Advocate for respondent No.1.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J.(ORAL)

The Punjab Public Service Commission (for short "Commission") issued an advertisement No. 17 of 2019 on 05.04.2019, inviting applications from the eligible candidates to fill up the posts of Judicial Magistrates in the State of Punjab. The petitioner had also applied in the general category.

The examination was to be conducted in three phases, i.e. preliminary examination, written examination and *viva voce*. In the preliminary examination, the petitioner secured 312 marks, whereas the cut off was of 324 marks. The petitioner has raised the grievance in respect of four question Nos. 22, 33, 88 and 115 of Booklet

Code 'D'.

At the time of issuance of notice of motion, following order was passed by this Court:-

"Counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that petitioner had sent e-mail on 28.08.2019 raising the objections with regard to the Question No. 22 of Question Paper Code 'D' but the said question has not been considered by the Expert Committee.

Notice of motion for 13.11.2019.

To be shown in the urgent list.

It is made clear that in case that question is found to have been considered by the Committee, then this writ petition shall be dismissed on this ground alone."

Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.1 has submitted that out of four questions, two question Nos.33 and 115 have already been dealt with by this Court in the case of ***Harvinder Singh Johal Versus Registrar General, Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court and another***, CWP No. 28691 of 2019, decided on 06.11.2019. The benefit of question No.33 has also been given to all the candidates across the Board but answer key of question No.115 has been held to be correct. Insofar as grievance of the petitioner that the objection filed by him in respect of question Nos. 22 and 88 has not been dealt with is concerned, counsel for respondent No.1 has produced the report in a sealed cover, which has been opened in the Court and after its perusal, we have found that both the questions have duly been considered by the expert committee and the answer key prepared by the examiner has been approved.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, muchless the order passed on 07.11.2019 at the time of issuance of notice of motion, which is peremptory in nature, we do not find any reason to interfere in this petition and hence, the same is hereby dismissed.

**(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE**

**(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE**

13.11.2019
pooja saini

Whether speaking/reasoned?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No