

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

**LPA No. 227 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.02.2020**

Kamalpreet Kaur

... Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI SHANKER JHA,
CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE**

Present: Mr. J.S. Sidhu, Advocate,
for the appellant.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

This is an intra-court appeal, under Clause X of the Letters Patent, against a judgment and order dated 10.9.2019, rendered by the learned Single Judge, vide which the writ petition preferred by the petitioner, has since been dismissed.

Pursuant to an advertisement dated 28.1.2019, the Punjab Public Service Commission (respondent No.3) invited applications online to fill up 92 posts of Senior Assistant in the Department of Revenue, Rehabilitation and Disaster Management as also the Department of Cooperation. The appellant, being one of the candidates, competed for selection. Her grievance has been that she had attempted and correctly answered 109 questions, and therefore, in terms of the answer key published by the Commission, she was entitled to be awarded 272.5 marks, whereas, she was awarded 267.5 marks.

AMIT KUMAR
2020.02.21 14:43
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

It is not disputed that in terms of clause 7(b) of the advertisement, if a candidate files a frivolous objection to the answer key published by the Commission, he/she draws negative marking, equal to the weightage of the question. Concededly, the appellant had filed objections to the provisional answer key, which were found to be frivolous by the experts. Thus, in the given situation, in terms of clause 7(b), *ibid*, five marks were deducted from her score, i.e. $272.5 - 5 = 267.5$. It is not the case of the appellant that opinion of the experts to term her objections as frivolous was erroneous. Clause 7(b) is not in question either, for no challenge is laid thereto. *Ex facie*, the purpose and the object sought to be achieved, vide clause 7(b), is to dissuade the candidates from filing frivolous objections which impede the examination/selection process, resulting in delay in declaration of result.

In the wake of the above, we are dissuaded to interfere with the impugned judgment. The appeal being bereft of merit is accordingly dismissed.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

February 17, 2020
AK Sharma

Whether speaking / reasoned: YES
Whether Reportable: NO