

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

149

CWP-6330-2024
Date of Decision: 18.03.2024

Mohit Narang ...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. N.K. Malhotra, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. Ashish Rawal, Senior Panel Counsel,
for Union of India-respondents

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking cancellation/quashing of Question No.89 of Question Paper (Annexure P-4) for the post of Assistant.
2. The petitioner, pursuant to an advertisement, applied under EWS quota. There was one paper carrying 100 marks. As per the advertisement, all the questions would be multiple choice questions and every question will have four options.
3. Mr. N.K. Malhotra, Advocate submits that in case of Question No.89, there are five options i.e. 'a' 'b' 'c' 'd' and 'e'. The said question needs to be cancelled because there could not be five options to a question.

4. From the perusal of Question No.89, it is evident that there is no figure corresponding to answer ‘e’. It appears there is some printing error. For the ready reference, the said question is reproduced as below:-

89. The coverage amount under the EDLI scheme can be upto a maximum of:
- a. Rs.7,00,000
 - b. Rs.6,00,000
 - c. Rs.5,00,000
 - d. Rs.8,00,000
 - e.

5. No figure has been assigned to answer ‘e’, thus, there was no question of confusion. This Court is of the consider opinion that petition *sans* merit and the same deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

18.03.2024
Mohit Kumar

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