

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(116)	CWP-3204-2024 Date of Decision : 13.02.2024	
Geeta	Versus	...Petitioner
State of Haryana and others		...Respondents
(117)	CWP-3207-2024	
Sohit	Versus	...Petitioner
State of Haryana and another		...Respondents
(118)	CWP-3214-2024	
Asma Bano and another	Versus	...Petitioners
State of Haryana and others		...Respondents
(119)	CWP-3219-2024	
Ankit Kumar	Versus	...Petitioner
State of Haryana and another		...Respondents
(120)	CWP-3221-2024	
Sangeeta	Versus	...Petitioner
Haryana Staff Selection Commission		...Respondent
(121)	CWP-3222-2024	
Ravinder	Versus	...Petitioner
State of Haryana and others		...Respondents

(122) CWP-3229-2024

Tushar and others ...Petitioners

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission ...Respondent

(123) CWP-3232-2024

Rajni ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. G.S. Gopra, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-3204-2024.

Mr. Shokeen S. Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-3207-2024.

Mr. Randhir Singh Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-3219-2024.

Mr. Kuldeep Khandelwal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-3221-2024.

Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate,
Mohd. Tarif, Advocate and
Mr. Vikrant, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-3214-2024.

Mr. Ravinder Singh Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-3222 & 3232-2024.

Mr. Ankur Sidhar, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-3229-2024.

Mr. Harish Nain, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. By this common order, the above mentioned writ petitions, the details of which have been given in the heading, are being decided as all these petitions involve the same question of law on similar facts.

2. Present petitions have been filed for directing the respondents to remove the technical glitch on the site and revise the final result dated 05.02.2024 to the extent that petitioners have not been selected in the final result despite securing higher marks than the last selected candidate in the category in which the petitioners are competing on the ground that the documents required to prove the eligibility have not been uploaded.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that keeping in view the answer keys, which have been issued by the respondents and the answers given by the petitioners while appearing in the written examination, the petitioners should have been given more marks and should have been within the zone of consideration for appointment. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have not been selected in the final result dated 05.02.2024 only on the ground that their documents were not uploaded on the website of the Commission due to a technical glitch, which has caused prejudice to the petitioners, hence, the respondents are under obligation to consider the candidature of the petitioners and revise the result dated 05.02.2024.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Harish Nain, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that after the declaration of the result dated 05.02.2024, certain representations have been received by the candidates stating that they have secured more marks than the last selected candidate in the respective categories but they have not been selected on the ground that due to a technical glitch, either they could not apply or upload all the required documents to prove eligibility and the State has already taken a decision on 10.02.2024 that the candidate, who possess qualification through a valid document issued to support the said claim of eligibility upto the last date of submission of application forms, will be treated as eligible for further participation in the selection process in case, the said candidate has secured more marks than the last candidate in the category in which he/she is competing keeping in view the result declared by the respondent-Commission.

7. Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that in case, due to a glitch in the portal, any candidate could not apply but is having more marks than the last candidate, who has been allowed to compete further, they may file representation raising the said claim before the authorities concerned and in case any such claim is raised before the authorities concerned including the claim under decision dated 10.02.2024, the same will be looked into and appropriate order will be passed within a period of 10 days of the receipt of any such claim or

before date fixed for written examination for the relevant categories, whichever is earlier.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the present petitions may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further at this stage, with liberty to the petitioners to raise the grievance by filing appropriate representation.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. It is directed that in case, any of the post against which the petitioners are competing and is still lying vacant as of now, the same be kept vacant till the decision of their representation.

11. A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

13.02.2024.

kv

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No