

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

CWP-5257-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: September 06, 2022

Suman Bala

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. Yashwinder Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Brijender Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing respondent-Commission to consider the petitioner for interview for the post of MPHWP (Female) against advertisement No.1/2015 dated 19.06.2015 (category No.9) (Annexure P-1) as she belongs to General Category and other candidates in the same category who got less marks were called for interview.

2. Pledged case is that the petitioner competed for selection to the post of MPHWP (Female), for which she was fully eligible under the General Category. She qualified the written examination and was even called for scrutiny of documents. Her grievance is that as per the self assessed OMR Sheet and the answer-key uploaded by the Commission on its website, she had obtained 100 marks, whereas the last candidate in the category of the petitioner, who has been called for interview, had secured 98 marks. She claims to have repeatedly represented to the respondents, vide representations dated 16.2.2018

and 22.02.2018 (Annexures P7 and P8 respectively), but for some intangible reasons, the candidature of the petitioner has since been ignored.

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

4. Vide order dated 05.03.2018 passed by a coordinate Bench of this Court, petitioner was provisionally allowed to be interviewed, however, her result was ordered not to be pronounced till further orders. Now result has been declared and the same reveals that petitioner secured aggregate of 112 marks (92 marks in written + 20 marks for interview). On a Court query, learned State counsel under instructions submits that petitioner secured lesser marks than the last selected candidate, who scored 128 marks. He further submits that no candidate having lesser score than the petitioner has been appointed on the post in question.

5. In the premise, it seems that being unaware of her actual result, the petitioner was misled into filing the instant petition premised on an understanding that she has secured more marks than the last selected candidate.

6. The result of the petitioner is not under challenge before this Court. Being so, no further grounds to interfere are made out.

7. Dismissed.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

September 06, 2022
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No