

129

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

CWP-2822-2024

Date of Decision:08.02.2024

TARANJEET KAUR MALHOTRA

..... Petitioner

Versus

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK AND OTHERS

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Ms. Neha Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gourav Goyal, Advocate
for the respondents-Bank.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of communication dated 06.04.2021 (Annexure P-9) whereby claim of the petitioner has been declined.

2. The petitioner is a retired employee of respondent-Bank. She participated in a promotional exam which was conducted on 21.02.2021. As per petitioner, she could not save answers of different questions due to technical glitch in the software. She made representation dated 22.02.2021 (Annexure P-4) which was followed by 05.03.2021 (Annexure P-5) wherein the petitioner requested the respondent-Bank to look into her grievance *qua* technical glitch in the software. The respondent by order dated 06.04.2021 (Annexure P-9) has rejected claim of the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent

relying upon report of a private agency has rejected claim of the petitioner. She was on the verge of retirement and it was her last chance to get promotion. She could not cut the ice because of technical glitch in the software.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Gourav Goyal, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the respondents-Bank and waives service.

6. With the consent of both sides, the matter is taken up for final disposal.

7. Learned counsel for the respondents-Bank submits that by order dated 06.04.2021 (Annexure P-9), the Competent Authority has decided representations of the petitioner. The report was sought from Tata Consultancy Services which was responsible for functioning of the software.

8. I have heard the arguments of both sides and with the able assistance of learned counsels have perused the record.

9. The respondent by order dated 06.04.2021 (Annexure P-9) has rejected representation of the petitioner. The relevant extracts of order dated 06.04.2021 read as:

“This has reference to your letter dated 22.02.2021 & 05.03.2021 enclosing therewith request of Ms. Taranjeet Kaur Malhotra regarding non submission of answers in promotion exam (Scale III to IV) held on 21.02.21.

The matter was placed before the Recruitment Cell, Head Office and vide their office letter dated 05.04.2021, as submitted as under:

Ms. Taranjeet has represented that she could not complete the online examination due to technical problems and as a result, many answers remained unsaved.

We forwarded the above representation of Ms. Taranjeet to IBPS for examination of the matter and IBPS vide email dated 05.04.2021 has replied as under:

- > TCS team reported that there was no issue on day of exam. Candidate did not raise a complaint during exam regarding any system issue.*
- > As per log sheet sent by IBPS, all attempts were saved successfully and candidate was able to toggle in between the questions.*
- > Also candidate had the clicked 'save and next' and 'mark as review' but without selecting an option.*

In view of the above, it could be ascertained that there was no technical glitch during the conduct of online test and thus, representation of Ms. Taranjeet Kaur does not hold any merit.”

- 10. Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present petition.
- 11. Dismissed as withdrawn.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

08.02.2024
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>