



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

122

CWP-1357-2025

Date of Decision: 20.01.2025

SUBE SINGH

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA**

Present:- Mr. Ravinder Bangar, Advocate  
for the petitioner.


**TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)**

This petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the revised result dated 13.12.2022, Annexure P-14, in response to advertisement 06/2006, dated 29.07.2006, Annexure P-1, *qua* the petitioner since 'ten to fifteen extra marks' have not been added in his result on account of failure to attempt last five questions of written examination due to shortage of time.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that at the time of written examination on 23.08.2020, wrong question paper was given to the petitioner initially, and it was replaced only after about forty minutes. This caused wastage of crucial time, due to which the petitioner was unable to attempt all the questions. He is entitled to be awarded atleast ten-fifteen extra/grace marks on this account which will entitle him to selection against the advertised post. Although selection has been made, the posts are still lying vacant and the petitioner's candidature can be considered against the same.

3. It is apparent on record that the petitioner earlier approached this

Court by filing CWP-18425-2020 titled *Sube Singh and another v. State of*



*Haryana and others, inter alia*, against the answer key of the written examination. The petition was disposed of, along with batch of similar petitions, vide order dated 26.07.2022, on a statement made by learned counsel representing the Commission that it intended to place all the objections received from the candidates regarding the examination before a panel of subject experts to avoid any prejudice to any of the candidates so far as the selection was concerned. After about two and a half years of the decision, the petitioner has again approached this Court on a similar cause, though the order passed in his earlier petition was never challenged. He had the opportunity to raise the grievance about shortage of time and claim grace marks on that account in the earlier petition also, but it was never done. His failure to do so amounts to giving up the claim altogether which cannot be agitated again by filing the instant petition. Besides, the written test in question was held on 23.08.2020. The selection pursuant thereto has already been finalised and appointments have also been given to the selected candidates.

4. In view thereof, there is no ground to entertain the petition and it stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)  
JUDGE

20.01.2025  
*Ad*

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |