

215

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

**CWP-27646-2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.12.2022**

Paramveer Singh and another

....Petitioners

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. Ravinder Singh Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, D.A.G., Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari for quashing Answer Key dated 03.08.2017 (Annexure P-2) to the extent that answers to the questions No.12 and 72 in Series No.06 are incorrect and the answers given by the petitioners are correct. Further prayer has been made to quash notice dated 27.11.2017 (Annexure P-5) whereby the petitioners have not been called for interview.

2. Pledged case is that pursuant to advertisement No.11 dated 01.12.2015 (Annexure P-1), petitioner No.1 applied for the post of Taxation Inspector under General Category and petitioner No.2 applied under BCA Category. Written examination was conducted and both petitioners were provided Series '06' of the Question Paper. Impugned Answer Key (Annexure P-2 Colly) was uploaded on 03.08.2017 and objections were invited. Thereafter vide impugned notice dated 27.11.2017 (Annexure P-5), candidates were called

for interview but the petitioners' name were not found mentioned therein. Claim of the petitioners is that the answers in the 'Answer Key' for both questions i.e. questions No.12 and 72 in Series No.06 Question Paper, are incorrect and if they get grace marks against the said questions, they will fall within the selection zone.

3. I have heard rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

4. Having remained unsuccessful in the selection for post of Taxation Inspector, petitioners are before this Court challenging the entire selection process.

5. Challenge to the selection *inter alia* is premised on the ground that the answers uploaded on the website as per 'Answer Key' in respect of Questions No.12 & 72 Series '06' of the question paper, are incorrect as against the purported correct answers given by the petitioners. To be noted that selection took place in the year-2017 and the petitioners had though filed the writ petition immediately challenging the same, but somehow petition remained pending and in the meanwhile, successful candidates were offered appointment and have been working ever since.

6. Be that as it may, let us advert to the merits of the claim that the answers of the questions by the petitioners despite being correct, they have not been given the benefit of marks *qua* the same. Contention is that had they been awarded marks for those 2 questions, their position in merit would have been higher than ones, who have been declared successful.

7. *Qua* the said two questions, the same were referred to the expert committee constituted at the relevant time in the year-2017 and after having obtained their opinion, the answers, as per the final answer-key, which were

uploaded by the State, were sustained and it was on that basis that all the candidates have been evaluated across board. To sit in appeal over the report of the Committee would amount to assuming the expertise of being an expert of an expert, which no doubt, in certain cases this Court may venture into, but instant is not the case deserving any such indulgence. Trite it is to say, it is not for this Court to superimpose its own views as against those of the experts.

8. As an upshot of the above discussion, petitioners have since secured lesser marks than the last selected candidate and there being no irregularity in the procedure adopted by the State, as noted hereinabove, I do not find any grounds for interference.

9. Dismissed.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

December 08, 2022
ashish

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No