



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

1494

CWP-11638-2014 (O & M)
Date of decision: 11.07.2025

Karanbir Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Satnam Preet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer made in this petition for quashing the result of preliminary examination of Punjab State Civil Services Combined Competitive Examination, 2013 conducted by respondent No.3, pursuant to advertisement dated 06.12.2013, might not even be surviving due to the efflux of time.

2. As is apparent from the averments made in para 11 of the petition that the objections regarding various questions, including Nos.37 and 50, raised by the petitioner and other candidates, however, answer key was revised only regarding Nos. 4, 6, 12 and 20 only.

3. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, refers to counter affidavit filed by the Secretary, PPSC, Patiala, dated 26.06.2014, wherein it has been categorically denied that the queries received from the petitioner (before the stipulated date) were not about these questions, rather it is only after declaration of the result finding himself not shortlisted and raised queries about question Nos.37 and 50 on 14.05.2014

for the first time and the subject expert has examined the matter and found answers of all questions of Paper-1 (General Studies) to be correct and decided to revise the answer keys of 4 questions of Paper-II (Civil Services Aptitude Test), to which no replication was filed. He further refers to the judgment dated 28.05.2025 passed in CWP-19486-2021 titled as **Lakshay Chahal vs. Haryana Staff Selection Commission and another**, wherein issue of answer key has been extensively dealt with by referring to the law laid down in this regard by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and held that the setting and assessment of questions in competitive examinations, the opinion of the Expert Committee is to be accepted primary and deference.

4. Disposed of, reserving the petitioner with a liberty to get it revived by demonstrating that the *lis* still subsists.

11.07.2025

parveen kumar

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

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE