



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

127

LPA-1997-2025 (O&M).**Date of Decision: 25.09.2025.**

Ranjit Singh

....Appellant.

VERSUS

The State of Punjab and others

....Respondents.

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. S.S. Sodhi, Advocate for
Mr. R.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate for the applicant/appellant.
Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab.
Mr. Anupam Singla, Advocate for respondent No.2.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)**CM-4948 and 4949-LPA-2025**

Prayer in these applications is for condonation of delay of 20 days in filing and 46 days in re-filing the appeal respectively.

Heard.

For the reasons stated in the applications, the same are allowed and delay of 20 days in filing and 46 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.

LPA-1997-2025

The appellant has challenged the judgment of the Single Bench dated 23.01.2025, whereby the writ petition preferred by him for considering him for appointment to the post of Punjabi Lecturer has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant had obtained 923 marks out of 1600 marks in Post-Graduation and, therefore, after 10% weightage, he was entitled to 5.768 marks instead of 5.531 marks as awarded during the selection process. In the event of the appellant, being awarded 5.768 marks towards Post-Graduation, he would have secured more marks than the last selected candidate in the 'General Category'.

3. Heard.

4. The appellant is stated to have applied for the post of Punjabi Lecturer pursuant to the Advertisement dated 18.06.2015 (Annexure P-1) under the 'General Category'. He had mentioned in the application form that he had secured 923 marks in Post-Graduation out of total marks of 1600, but at the time of scrutiny of documents, a certificate furnished by him indicated that he had obtained 885 marks out of 1600 marks, which is a categoric stand of the respondents in the written statement filed by the respondents. The appellant had also filed replication but the copy of the certificate indicating that he had obtained 923 marks had not been appended either with the writ petition or with the replication. He has also not produced the certificate along with the instant appeal. We are, therefore, in agreement with the judgment of the Single Bench that the marks in the Post-Graduation as reflected in the certificate, produced at the stage of scrutiny of documents would be considered.

5. In view of the above, we do not find any manifest illegality in the judgment of the Single Bench dismissing the writ petition of the appellant. Consequently, the Letters Patent Appeal, being devoid of any merit, stands dismissed. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

22.09.2025

<i>jitender</i>	Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes/ No
	Whether Reportable	:	Yes/ No