

CWP-18208-2019 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CWP-18208-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision :02.12.2025

Poonam Panwar

... Petitioner

Versus

Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench
and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present: Ms. Varuna Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Meena, Advocate for
Mr. Amit Arora, Senior Standing counsel
for respondents No.2 & 3.

Mr. Vikas Kathiala, Advocate for respondent No.5.

Mr. I. S. Sidhu, Advocate for respondent No.15.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, challenge is to the impugned order dated 08.05.2019 (Annexure P-26) passed by the respondent No.1-Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh, (hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal') by which, the challenge raised at the hands of the petitioner to the selection to the post of Senior Scientist/Scientist wherein, the respondent No.15 was selected, has been rejected by the Tribunal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that no criteria for giving marks for the interview had been advertised or made known to the



candidates by the respondents and, therefore, the grant of marks by the Interviewing Committee is incorrect.

2. Further argument raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the selection of private respondent is biased as the petitioner even did not see the said candidate on the date of interview. Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that the petitioner is a better suited candidate as compared to respondent No.15 for the post in question.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

4. It may be noticed that the Tribunal before passing the impugned order dated 08.05.2019 (Annexure P/26) had summoned the record and after being satisfied with the genuineness and fair play, impugned order had been passed where certain observations had been made by the Tribunal upholding the selection process. Further, it is a conceded position that all the arguments raised by the petitioner were dealt with by the Tribunal keeping in view the record produced though, the same were rejected.

5. Qua the argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the criteria for giving marks by the Interviewing Committee was not advertised prior to the said date and the same was only adopted after the interview, it may be noticed that the Tribunal has recorded a finding that as per the record, marks have been given by all the members of the Interviewing Committee and they have signed their respective sheets and thereafter, the average score of the candidates was prepared which sheet has been signed by all the members of Interviewing Committee. The

Interviewing Committee consisted of eminent persons of their field.

6. Once, a fair chance has been given to all the candidates and all the candidates have been evaluated by the same selection committee by adopting uniform criteria merely that the petitioner has not been able to make it to the selection zone, does not mean that the selection is biased or not based on any uniform criteria.

7. Qua the argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner did not see the respondent No.15 on the date of interview whereas, as per respondents, the private respondent appeared in the interview and was given marks, it may be noticed that once, all the arguments raised by the petitioner have been dealt with by the Tribunal and learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to point out any perversity in the findings so recorded by the Tribunal, no interference at the hands of this Court is called for. Once, the Tribunal on the basis of the record found that the selection is based upon merits of the candidates and the same is transparent and all the candidates have been given due opportunity and have been evaluated uniformly, merely because the petitioner feels that she is better suited candidate, cannot be made a ground to set aside the selection in question.

8. No other argument has been raised.

9. Keeping in view the totality of the fact and circumstances, no ground for interference at the hands of this Court is made out and the present petition is accordingly dismissed.

9. Civil miscellaneous application pending, if any is also disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

December 02, 2025

aarti

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No