2025:PHHC:101332

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

216 CWP-11135-2020 (O & M)
Date of decision: 06.08.2025

Amanpreet Singh ....Petitioner

Versus

Chairman Punjab Public Service Commission and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Manglesh Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Shakti Mehta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer made is for quashing the final merit list dated 17.07.2020.

2. Learned counsel submits that excessive marks have been granted in interview to the candidates, who secured less in the written examination, ignoring the preferential qualification of the petitioner and higher marks obtained by him in the written test.

3. Learned State counsel refers to para 4 of short affidavit of the Secretary (Examinations), Punjab Public Service Commission, Patiala, dated 04.01.2021, wherein it has been stated that 5% extra marks have been granted to the petitioner and Mehakdeep Singh for having qualification of M.Sc. (Agriculture), while not to Rupinder Singh Cheema who otherwise obtained higher marks in interview.

PARVEEN KUMAR
2025.08.08 14:48
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this
order/judgment.

4. As regards the assessment made during the interview, causing the total score of the petitioner to be 244.20, whilst that of above-named candidates 255.20 and 254.50, it would be worthwhile to refer to **Lalit Kumar vs. State of Punjab,** CWP-26845-2013 decided on 20.12.2016, wherein it was held that a writ Court cannot sit as one of appeal and try to re-assess the relative merit of the candidates assessed at the oral interview by the Selection Committee, which is determined based on their overall performance.

5. It is trite that a candidate without any demur having rubbed shoulders with others in a selection, however, on the result not being palatable to him, cannot challenge the same by alleging that there was some flaw in the process or unfairness in the interview.

6. It is on the subjective satisfaction of the Committee that it grants marks in the interview, which is based on how well one had fared in the said process. The marks assigned for interview in the criteria prescribed have not been shown to be beyond the permissible percentage. Merely asserting that had the petitioner been awarded some more marks in the interview, he would have been selected, is neither here nor there. No selection process would culminate, if unsuccessful candidates, who fetched lower marks in the interview, were to raise such an argument.

7. In view of the above, the present petition being bereft of merits is dismissed.

06.08.2025 **(AMAN CHAUDHARY)**
parveen kumar **JUDGE**

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

PARVEEN KUMAR
2025.08.08 14:48
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this
order/judgment.