

103 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-1824-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 13.02.2024

Harbinder Kaur

.....Petitioner

V/s

Panjab University, Business School Chandigarh through its Registrar

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Mr.Ishneet Bhatia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Gehna Vaishnavi Advocate
for respondent.

DEEPAK SIBAL J. (ORAL)

Through the present petition, the petitioner seeks admission to the Ph.D. programme in the respondent-Panjab University (for short – PU).

2. The PU issued a brochure through which applications were invited for admission to 04 Ph.D. programmes in Business Economics, Information Systems and Operations. One of the 04 programmes was reserved for candidates belonging to the Scheduled Tribes and the remaining 03 were to be filled up from General Caterory candidates. The eligibility and selection criteria was detailed in the brochure.

3. The petitioner applied for consideration of her candidature against the 03 Ph.D. programmes to be filled up from candidates belonging to the General Category. She along with 04 other candidates was declared eligible.

4. As per the prescribed selection criteria 70% of the total marks were ear-marked for academic performance and remaining 30% for interview/viva voce. Candidates were also required to submit a research proposal to be carried

out by the candidate in the Ph.D. programme which was also to be assessed at the time of the candidate's interview.

5. The petitioner, along with other eligible/short listed candidates appeared before the Interview Board. Thereafter, the merit list was published in which the petitioner was not selected and was shown at Sr. No. 1 in the waiting list.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is a Gold Medalist in MCom; the petitioner is also a Junior Research Fellow; in this course also, the petitioner had scored the highest marks in her entire batch; thus, in academics, the other 04 eligible candidates were no match to the petitioner; it is not possible that in the interview/viva voce the petitioner would have scored low marks and that in any case the marks secured by the petitioner in her interview/viva voce have not been disclosed.

7. In response to the notice issued by this Court the PU filed a response through which it is submitted that out of the 70% ear-marked for academic performance the petitioner had secured 58.06 marks; the Interviewing Board which comprised of Senior Professors of the University Business School awarded the petitioner 03 out of 10 marks for her research proposal and 5.67 marks out of 20 for her interview/viva voce and that the other 04 who were offered admission to the Ph.D. programme had all scored higher marks than the petitioner.

8. No rejoinder was filed by the petitioner.

9. The petitioner has a brilliant academic record. She is a Gold Medalist in Mcom. She also was the highest scorer in her batch when she became a Junior Research Fellow. The petitioner does not dispute her academic score. Therefore, to allay any apprehensions that she has with regard to the marks secured by her in her interview/viva voce, we directed the learned counsel for the

PU to produce before us the original proceedings of the Interview Board which direction was duly complied with.

10. A perusal of the produced record revealed that as many as 06 Senior professors of the University Business School of the PU have evaluated the petitioner’s research proposal and thereafter given her marks out of 10, the average of which comes to 03. The same 06 professors also evaluated the petitioner’s performance in the interview and have awarded her marks the average of which comes to 5.67 out of 20 marks. The proceedings have also been signed by all the members of the Interviewing Board. Thus, no discrepancy has been found in the petitioner’s result as has been declared by the PU.

11. In the light of the above and especially in the absence of any malafide having even been pleaded by the petitioner against the Interviewing Board or any of its members, we find no merit in the instant petition.

12. Dismissed.

13. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

13.02.2024
Sapna

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