

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

CWP-878-2021

Date of decision: 18.04.2022

Anil

...Petitioner

Vs.

Haryana Staff Selection Commission and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. Nikhil Anand, Advocate,
For the petitioner.

Mr. R.K.S. Brar, Additional A.G., Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner herein, *inter alia*, seeks issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the final result dated 22.02.2020 (Annexure P-8) as also the corrigendum result dated 11.06.2020 (Annexure P-12) issued by Haryana Staff Selection Commission qua the selection of Junior Engineer (Electrical) under BCB category, wherein the petitioner was declared unsuccessful.

Petitioner applied for the post of Junior Engineer (Electrical) under BCB Category by giving an undertaking as per prescribed form dated 01.07.2019 for obtaining marks under socio economic criteria. Petitioner claims that he has secured 61 marks but yet not even called for scrutiny of documents, though the cut off for the same is 59 marks.

While issuing notice of motion vide order dated 14.01.2021, one post of Junior Engineer (Electrical) under BC-B reservation category was ordered to be kept vacant till the next date of hearing.

Learned State counsel strenuously opposes the writ petition and argues on the lines of defense taken in the reply on record.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the case file.

In the return filed on behalf of the respondents, it has been specifically stated that after the written examination, petitioner was not called for the next round of scrutiny of documents as he has secured lesser marks than the last candidates called for said next round. Petitioner has scored 55 marks in the written examination, whereas the cut off for scrutiny of documents in the category in which petitioner had applied is 56 marks.

The scoring of the marks being factual matter cannot be adjudicated under extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court. In any case, no replication has been filed despite opportunity. In the premise, the affidavit filed in response to the petition stating that cut off marks for scrutiny of documents to call for next round, in the category in which petitioner had applied, being 56 marks remains uncontroverted.

That apart, self-assessment of the petitioner as has been pleaded in the petition, and also being canvassed by learned counsel for the petitioner, that she had secured 60 marks is of no consequence. What is to be given credence is the result/assessment by the examiner and not the self-assessment of the petitioner.

No grounds are made out to interfere.

Dismissed.

18.04.2022
vandana

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No