

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

**CWP No.15951 of 2018 (O&M)**

Date of Decision.17.01.2023

Reena Devi

...Petitioner

Vs

Chaudhary Ranbir Singh University and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR**

Present: Mr. Deepak Vashisht, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kuldeep Sheoran, Advocate  
for the respondents.

-.-

**JAISHREE THAKUR J. (ORAL)**

The present writ petition has been filed for issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari for quashing the result of Computer Proficiency Test held by the respondent University on 15.06.2018 and further to issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing the respondents to entertain the candidature of the petitioner and allow her to appear for interview for the post of Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator under advertisement No.06/2016 dated 17.06.2016.

In brief, the facts are that the petitioner applied under advertisement No.6/2016 dated 17.06.2016 whereby online application forms were invited for filling up certain posts under various categories. The petitioner had applied for the post of Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator and appeared in the written test on 05.02.2017, which she qualified. She undertook the typing test and also qualified the same. The Computer Proficiency Test comprised of two parts viz; (a) objective test for 25 marks and (b) practical examination of 25 marks. The petitioner was allocated 16 marks in first part but only 3 marks out of 25 marks in the second part of said

test, which is not sustainable. There were total four questions in the said part and since the petitioner had attempted three questions, she should have been awarded more marks than the ones allocated. Aggrieved against not being called for interview on the basis of lower marks secured, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of instant writ petition.

Counsel for the petitioner would contend that being eligible and having undertaken the written examination, the petitioner undertook the practical test and answered three questions out of total four questions and therefore, she ought to have been given adequate marks for three questions she attempted.

Pursuant to notice of motion having been issued, reply has been filed on behalf of the respondents.

Learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that petitioner was eligible to apply for the post in question and on that basis, she undertook the written examination, however, did not qualify second part of Computer Proficiency Test for the post of Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator. It is submitted that there were four questions and all were compulsory. The petitioner was to create a worksheet and fill in the information as called for in the question, however, the petitioner was unable to do so. Similarly, there were three other questions where charts were to be generated by the petitioner, however, she was unable to do so. It is submitted that instead of three questions answered as has been claimed by the petitioner, she only attempted one and that too incomplete. Consequently, the writ petition ought to be dismissed.

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

In view of the categoric stand taken by the respondents that petitioner did not qualify the Computer Proficiency Test, which was relevant for appointment to the post of Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator, this Court finds no ground to interfere in the said matter. No substantial question of law is involved. Consequently, the instant writ petition stands dismissed.

(JAISHREE THAKUR)  
JUDGE

January 17, 2023  
Pankaj\*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |