



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

LPA No.1652 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 21.07.2025

SUBORDINATE SERVICES SELECTION BOARD, PUNJAB

.....Appellant

Versus

GAURAV KUMAR ALIAS GAURAV KUMAR MUNJAL AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, AAG, Punjab  
for the appellant.

\* \* \* \* \*

**ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)**

**CM-4058-LPA-2025**

This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 126 days  
in filing the appeal.

Issue notice to the respondents.

Respondents No.2 and 4 have filed a caveat and Mr. Anshul  
Baghla, Advocate, has appeared on behalf of respondents No.2 & 4. He  
submits that he has not have any objection if the delay is condoned.

In view of the above, the application is allowed and delay of  
126 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

**Main Appeal**

This appeal has been directed against the impugned judgment



dated 17.12.2024 passed by a Single Judge, whereby respondents No.2 and 4 were directed to be treated as eligible and to be considered for appointment against the advertised post as per their merit.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that respondents No.2 and 4 had failed in the first chance of type test and could not take the benefit for the subsequent test which was meant only for those candidates who had been absent in the first test on account of a flood like situation in the State of Punjab which prevented them from appearing in the examination.

3. Heard.

4. Respondents No.2 and 4 had appeared in the type test for the post of Legal Clerk but could not qualify the same. The appellant had held another type test for the candidates who could not appear in the first test. Respondents No.2 and 4 had approached this Court by preferring a writ petition and by the interim order, they were provisionally allowed to appear in the type test along with the absentee candidates who could not take the first test. Respondents No.2 and 4 had duly qualified the type test in the second attempt. The learned Single Bench, by the impugned judgment has directed that the case of respondents No.2 and 4 should also be considered for appointment along with other candidates in terms of their merit.

5. We do not find any illegality whatsoever in the order of the learned Single Bench as respondents No.2 and 4 having duly qualified the type test, could not be denied consideration for appointment to the post of Legal Clerk for the reason that someone who attempts the examination but fails to qualify, cannot be at a disadvantage *vis-a-vis* a candidate who did not



participate or is absent on the day of the examination.

6. Consequently, we do not find any merit in this appeal, which stands dismissed. All pending miscellaneous application(s) also stand disposed of.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)**  
**JUDGE**

**21.07.2025**  
*sandeep*

|                             |        |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Whether Speaking/Reasoned : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable :        | Yes/No |