



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

Sr. No.118

CWP-15008-2025

Date of Decision: 03.07.2025

Manju Kumari

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kumar Tada, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate, for respondent no.3/Commission.


TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondent/Commission to re-check questions no.3(A), 4(B) and 8 of the petitioner's answer booklet of Subject Knowledge Test for the post of PGT Chemistry in response to advertisement 19/2024.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that on being allowed to inspect answer sheet of Subject Knowledge Test, it transpired that answers to questions no.8 and 3A(i) had not been evaluated, which caused serious prejudice to her.

3. Pursuant to the last order, petitioner's answer booklet for the test has been produced in the Court, perusal whereof makes it apparent that all the aforementioned questions no.8 and 3 [including 3A(i)] have been duly evaluated by the examiner; 7.5 and 7 marks, respectively, have been assigned for the said questions.

4. The answer booklet has been returned to learned counsel for the Commission, who, on instructions, contends that even if marks for question



no.3(A)(i), which is of 2.5 marks and statedly has not been evaluated, are taken to have been awarded to the petitioner, her total marks would be 52.63, as against the cut-off for General category, i.e., 54.40 marks.

5. Evidently, the petitioner’s answer booklet has been duly evaluated, and her score is far below the cut-off marks.

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

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

03.07.2025
Maninder

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