

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Civil Writ Petition No. 7077 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 24.05.2023

Paramjit Singh
... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and Others
... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Kapil Kakkar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Navdeep Chhabra, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent No.1 to 4.

Mr. Gurminder Singh, Senior Advocate
with Ms. Harpriya Khaneka, Advocate
for the respondent No.5.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. The petitioner prays for the issuance of the writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the public notice/final result dated 09.03.2018. He asserts that the Punjab Public Service Commission has made an error by modifying the criteria for awarding marks in relation to the length of service after the recruitment notice was published.
2. The learned counsel representing the petitioner, while referring to page 65 of the paper-book, submits that on 06.09.2016, the Punjab Public Service Commission has made a deliberate decision to conduct the selection process based on the following criteria:-

<i>a) Parameters</i>	<i>Weightage (Marks)</i>
<i>Written Exam</i>	<i>50</i>

<i>ACRs/APARs</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Length of Service</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Interview</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Total:</i>	<i>100 Marks</i>

b) *The length of service would be categorised as follows:*

<u><i>Length of Service</i></u>	<u><i>Weightage (Marks)</i></u>
<i>8 to 12 years</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>12 to 16 years</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>16 and above years</i>	<i>15</i>

c) *It was also decided by the Commission that recommendations be sent to the Government for lowering the upper age limit for applying for Register A-II and Register-C from 54 to 45.*

He further submits that the recruitment notice was issued on the basis of the aforesaid criteria but after the screening test, the criteria for assessing the marks with respect to the length of service was changed on 13.10.2017.

3. On the other hand, the learned senior counsel representing the respondent No.5, while drawing the attention of the Court to the detailed judgment passed in ***Rakesh Parkash v. State of Punjab and Others (Civil Writ Petition No. 7326 of 2018, decided on 06.10.2020)***, submits that this aspect has already been considered at length while dismissing the writ petition. He submits that exactly the same issue was decided in the aforesaid writ petition which has been upheld by the Division Bench while deciding the ***Letters Patent Appeal No. 1057 of 2021 on 02.02.2022***.

4. The learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that the selection in the ***Rakesh Parkash’s case (supra)*** was made from the Register A-II, whereas, in this case, the selection is made from the Register “C”.

Civil Writ Petition No. 7077 of 2018 (O&M)**3**

5. This Court has considered the submissions of learned counsel representing the parties. The issue in the above mentioned case regarding the change in the criteria was not only identical, but even the decision is similar. Since a detailed judgment has already been passed on the issue in dispute, therefore, no further deliberation is required.

6. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and discussion, no ground is made out to issue the writ. Hence, the present writ petition is dismissed.

7. The miscellaneous application(s) pending, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

May 24, 2023**“DK”**

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No