

**CWP-7805-2019****1**

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

(243)**CWP-7805-2019****Date of Decision : August 05, 2024****Barinder Singh****.. Petitioner**

Versus

State of Punjab and others**.. Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI**

Present: Mr. Barinder Singh – petitioner in person.

Mr. Charan Preet Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present writ petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner is that though the petitioner was at Sr. No.1 in the merit list but he has not been selected ultimately for the post of Programme Monitor (Information Technology).

2. The petitioner, who appears in person, submits that once, in the screening test, which was conducted by the respondents, the petitioner had secured more marks, he should have been given appointment as compared to the respondents No. 5 and 6.

3. Upon notice of motion, the respondents have filed the reply. In the reply, the respondents have stated that a criteria was fixed as to how, the selection is to be made, much prior to the advertisement. As per the criteria,



in case there are more than 15 candidates to apply for, then there has to be a screening test and the candidates who cleared the screening test, are to be evaluated on the basis of basic qualification, higher qualification, experience, computer knowledge and interview.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that though the petitioner secured maximum marks in the screening test and was evaluated by the experts on the basis of criteria fixed and the petitioner was only able to secure 46.10 marks whereas respondent No.6 had secured 72.54 marks to be selected against the post of Programme Monitor.

5. As per the respondents, the selection was transparent hence, the allegation that the petitioner despite being topper in the merit has not been selected, is incorrect.

6. I have heard the petitioner as well as the learned counsel for the respondents.

7. A bare perusal of the above mentioned facts would show that a due criteria was fixed to evaluate the candidates for the purpose of selection/appointment. As per the criteria, in case there were more than 15 candidates applying, the screening test was to be conducted and in the screening test conducted, the petitioner qualified to be evaluated under the criteria fixed for selection for the given post but under the criteria, the petitioner could not get the maximum marks to be topper. Respondent No. 6 was topper with 72.54 marks and the petitioner was at No.10 in the merit with 46.10 marks.

8. That being the position, the allegation that the petitioner being topper has been ignored at the cost of respondent No.6 is incorrect.

**CWP-7805-2019****3**

9. No other argument was raised.
10. Keeping in view the above, as the candidate has been evaluated on the basis of the criteria already mentioned and the said criteria has been followed for all the candidates uniformly, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.
11. Dismissed.

August 05, 2024
harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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