



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

217

CWP-15860-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 03.03.2025

Sapna Singla

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Vinay Bajaj, Advocate for
Mr. G.L. Bajaj, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Arun Gupta, DAG Punjab

Mr. Shivender Pal, Advocate for
Mr. B.S. Bhalla, Advocate for respondent No.5

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. The prayer made in the present petition is for quashing the order dated 28.12.2015, whereby the claim of the petitioner for appointment to the post of Teaching Fellow has been rejected.
2. The petitioner applied under General Category for appointment to the post of JBT/ETT, pursuant to the advertisement No.5 of September, 2007. Her claim is on the premise that initially respondent No.5 was shown to have secured 56.561% marks and at Serial No.1014 while the petitioner had 60.215%, at Serial No.915.
3. Pursuant to the directions of this Court to decide the legal notice, a speaking order dated 28.12.2015, as impugned in the present petition, has been passed showing that respondent No.5 as a matter of fact had obtained 65.561% marks, which have been substantiated by the averments made in para 3 of the reply dated 19.06.2018 filed by way of affidavit of District Education Officer (Elementary Education), which has not rebutted by filing any replication and reads



thus:

“That the petitioner has placed her reliance up on the merit of one Navroop Jit Kaur daughter of Jagtar Singh i.e. respondent no. 5. The petitioner has shown the merit of respondent no. 5 as 56.561. In this regard, it is submitted that during selection process earlier, the merit of respondent no. 5 was inadvertently calculated as 56.561 by the selection committee earlier. However, when the mistake in calculation of merit came in the notice of selection committee, this mistake of calculation was corrected by the selection committee. A copy of scrutiny forms of respondent no. 5 i.e. Navroop Jit Kaur is annexed herewith as Annexure R-2 and Annexure R-3. A perusal of Annexure R-2 and Annexure R-3 reveal that the merit of respondent no. 5 is 65.561. The committee has also recorded the reasons for change of this merit. The relevant part of which is reproduced here as under:-

"We have rechecked the claim and have found that merit points given by Evaluation Committee are not in order in fact the claimant deserves 65.561 merit points against 56.561 awarded by Evaluation Committee. Therefore, 65.561 merit points are certified to be awarded to the candidate. Necessary incorporation has also made in the evaluation Performa and in the website of www.dpipunjab.com".

- 3. The petitioner having secured lesser marks than even the last selected candidate, who obtained 62.709 in the general category, in any case did not fall within the zone of selection.
- 4. The submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that as per Annexures R-2 and R-3, the period of the experience as mentioned is not exactly the same, cannot be countenanced and makes no significant difference as it being nonetheless from year 2004 to 2007, which he also was unable to controvert.
- 5. In view of the above, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

03.03.2025

M.Kamra

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