



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

LPA-1316-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision : 27.05.2024

Rajat Gupta

.....Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Madhur Jangra, Advocate, for the appellant.

G.S. SANDHAWALIA, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

1. The challenge in this Letters Patent Appeal is to the order dated 24.04.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby the writ petition (CWP No. 7777 of 2024) filed by the appellant herein was dismissed.

2. The learned Single Judge noticed that the objections raised to Question No. 88 SET-D (General Knowledge & Awareness) Common Part of Level-3 (PGT in Computer Science) of Haryana Teacher Eligibility Test 2023 were considered by the subject experts. No error had been found in the answer options and the answer given in the final Answer Key was found correct. The writ petitioner's claim thus having been rejected, the learned Single Judge did not go into merits of the case as such and did not interfere with the order dated 06.02.2024 (Annexure P-14).

3. Learned counsel for the appellant has tried to convince this Court that there was material which showed that the option given as such was not a correct option and, therefore, he should be given benefit as such of one mark, which will make the appellant cross the cut-off.



4. The law stands settled in this aspect, whereby the Apex Court has time and again held that the Court could not arrogate to itself the powers of the expert Committee. Reference can be made to **H.P. Public Service Commission Vs. Mukesh Thakur and others**, 2010 (6) SCC 759, **U.P.P.S.C. and others Vs. Rahul Singh and others**, 2018 AIR (Supreme Court) 2861, **Ran Vijay Singh and others Vs. State of U.P and others**, 2018 (2) SCC 357 and **Vikesh Kumar Gupta and another Vs. State of Rajasthan and others**, 2021 (2) SCC 309.
5. In such circumstances, once in the order dated 06.02.2024 (Annexure P-14), which was subject matter of challenge before the learned Single Judge, there was specific stand as such that the matter had been referred to the expert Committee and the said Committee had opined upon the final Answer Key, the contention that the other option was correct as such cannot be gone into by this Court.
6. Resultantly, we do not find that the learned Single Judge erred in any manner in not interfering with the order dated 06.02.2014 (Annexure P-14).
7. The appeal thus stands dismissed *in limine*.

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

May 27, 2024
ndj

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No