

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

109

CWP- 51-2024 (O&M)
Decided on : 05.01.2024

ASHWANI

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

... RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

PRESENT: Mr. Pardeep Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Nain, AAG, Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI , J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner is shown to have secured 47.47 marks in the Common Eligibility Test for the post in question, whereas the qualifying marks required to continue for participating in further selection process is 47.50.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the answers of the answer key were revised by the respondents and thereafter, the revised result was issued and in the revised result, keeping in view the answers attempted by the petitioner, the score of the petitioner is 50.35 marks which is more than the qualifying marks i.e. 47.50 marks, hence, the petitioner is entitled to continue to participate in further selection process for the post in question.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Harish Nain, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of

respondents-State and submits that as per the instructions received from Mr.Jagdeep Mittal, Law Officer, HSSC, as per the revised answer key, the marks secured by the petitioner in the Common Eligibility Test is 47.47 marks only and the petitioner has not been able to secure the minimum required marks of 47.50 required to compete further for the post in question.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the instructions imparted to the learned State counsel are not correct. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further but liberty be given to the petitioner to get his written examination score ascertain, as obtained by him in the Common Eligibility Test by availing appropriate remedy including the remedy of representation or securing the documents under the Right to Information Act.

6. Further, the liberty is granted to the petitioner to revive the present petition in case the statement given by the learned State counsel that even after the revision of the answer key, the score of the petitioner remains 47.47 marks is found to be non-correct.

7. Ordered accordingly.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

05.01.2024

Riya

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