

<i>Evening Session:</i>		
Q. NO.	<i>Initial Answer Key</i>	<i>Final Answer Key</i>
8	<i>D</i>	<i>D</i>
10	<i>B</i>	<i>D</i>
39	<i>B</i>	<i>D</i>
41	<i>A</i>	<i>D</i>
55	<i>B</i>	<i>None</i>
76	<i>B</i>	<i>None</i>
83	<i>A</i>	<i>A, B</i>

The Court has spent time on each of the nine questions with the assistance of the learned counsel. The petitioners are satisfied with the opinion of the Subject Matter Expert on all questions except Q. No.50 (morning session) and Q. No.8 (evening session) (in CWP No.27672 of 2013; p.22 of paper-book). Question No.50 asked candidates to give the antonym of 'Miserly'. The initial answer key was 'D'. The final answer key is 'None'. The closest opposite of the word 'Miserly' appears to be 'Spendthrift' which is option 'B'. The word Generous would also be a close runner up which is option 'D'. It appears that the candidates who have gone by 'Spendthrift' cannot be deprived of two marks. So is the case with Q. No.8 in evening session. This petition narrows down to two of the nine questions i.e. Q. No.50 and 8. The Subject Matter Expert will file his personal affidavit in sealed cover explaining sources of his opinion on questions No.50 and 8. He would do so on the next date of hearing through the office of the Advocate General, Haryana. His name will not be disclosed to any party except by the leave of the Court having regard to the judgment passed by this Court in Ramandeep Kaur v. Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), 2017 (4) SCT 324. Meanwhile, the Commission will apply the final answer keys to the seven non disputed questions to the OMR sheets of the petitioners and disclose the result of the exercise to this Court. The OMR sheets of the three

petitioners be produced in original in sealed cover for the perusal of the Court. List again on 27.03.2018. A copy of this order be given to Ms. Goyal attested by the Bench Secretary. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the connected case.”

2. The said order was followed by 18.04.2018 which reads as:

“Original OMR sheets have been produced in Court in sealed cover also two papers regarding Q-50 and Q-8.

Secretary to appear in person to explain non-compliance of the order dated 20.02.2018 which has compelled adjournment. He would specifically answer qua applying answer keys to the 7 disputed questions and disclose the result of the exercise to this Court. Even question No.8 has not been answered in the papers produced in sealed cover. As per paper-setter question No.50 is ambiguous. Secretary would also explain that in two of the four OMR sheets produced in Court there are fluid marks on some of the circles and as to why the position has not been explained in the written statement.

The second sealed cover when opened reveals that there is fluid mark on OMR sheet of roll No. 003834.

Photocopy of the documents are retained on record and the originals have been returned.

Accordingly, an affidavit be filed with an advance copy to the counsel opposite before the next date of hearing. Also to showcase why contempt proceedings should not be initiated against those responsible for deliberately flouting the orders of this Court dated 20.02.2018.

List on 07.05.2018.

A photocopy of the order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

A copy of this order be given under the signatures of Bench Secretary.”

3. The matter relates to selection of 2008. A period of 17 years has passed away. The dispute is confined to answer key of one question.
4. At this stage, it would not be appropriate to disturb the selection of already selected candidate.
5. There is another aspect of the matter. The petitioner participated in the selection process which was initiated in 2008 and completed in 2010. A period of 17 years from the date of selection of other candidates has passed away. The post advertised was of SI (Male). Physical/mental fitness is of paramount consideration in the Police Force. The petitioner cannot be expected of having fitness as postulated for SI (Male) at the time of initial selection.
6. In the wake of above discussion and findings, the instant petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly hereby dismissed.
7. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

06.08.2025
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No