

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

210

CWP-19677-2013

Date of decision : 25.04.2022.

Ranjit Singh Dhillon

... Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Transmission Corporation Ltd. and others

.. Respondents

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Mohit Jaggi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate for respondents No.1 & 2.

Mr. Arun Nehra, Advocate for respondent No.3.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is seeking a direction to the respondents to award marks for six questions after correcting their answer key and prepare a fresh merit list for the post of Draftsman (Autocad)/Electrical.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had applied for the post of Draftsman (Autocad)/Electrical in response to the advertisement issued by the respondents on 11.11.2011. These posts were not filled up and the respondents had issued another advertisement dated 03.08.2012 and the petitioner had also applied in response thereto. The appointments could not be made as no candidate had secured the minimum required marks of 50. He also contends that there were several errors in the answer key and the petitioner along with other candidates had submitted objections which were not dealt with by the respondents.

Learned counsel for respondent No.3 submits that on the receipt of the objections, respondent No.3 had sought opinion of the subject experts and after re-checking of all the questions, the answer key was validated and

handed over to respondent No.1/PSTCL.

Learned counsel for respondents No.1 and 2/PSTCL submits that the petitioner had objected to the answers of six questions but he did not attempt four out of these questions. Even if, the petitioner was to be awarded full marks for other two questions, he would get 47.5 marks and fall short by 2.5 marks to clear the same. He also contends that as no candidate had obtained the benchmark of 50 marks, no selection could take place in pursuance to the advertisement issued on 03.08.2012.

Heard.

The petitioner had applied for the post of Draftsman (Autocad)/Electrical. in pursuance to the advertisement issued in the year 2012. The respondents did not select any candidate as no candidate had obtained the minimum benchmark of 50 marks. The petitioner is alleging errors in the answer key but he is stated to have attempted only two out of six questions wherein he had raised doubts. Even after he is awarded full marks for two questions, he would still fall short of the minimum qualifying marks. It is well settled that even a selected candidate has no right to appointment but in the instant case, neither the petitioner nor any other candidate has been selected. The advertisement was issued in the year 2012 and the counsel for the respondents submit that thereafter, several other selections have been carried out.

Consequently, I do not find any merit in this petition which stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

April 25, 2022
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No