



CWP-8552-2017 (O&M)

-1-

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

221

CWP-8552-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 20.02.2025

Amit Bansal

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Aakash Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner
Ms. Shruti, AAG, Punjab.
Mr. Vishal Deep Goyal, Advocate,
for respondent No.4.
Mr. Jagjot Singh, Advocate,
for respondent No.5.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer made in the present petition is for quashing the selection proceedings and the appointment letter dated 28.10.2016, Annexures P-7 and P-8, respectively.

2. The instructions mentioned in the advertisement dated 19.05.2015, Annexure P-1 envisaged that 15 marks in all could be granted for teaching experience/Post Doctorate/ Research Projects from extra mural agencies which has been explained by the *asterisk* at the end of page 21 of the paper-book, whereby 1 mark per semester and 1 mark for project per lac were to be awarded.

3. As per above, since the petitioner had not completed even one semester after his PhD, having left the College on 22.04.2016, as is evident from his application Annexure P3/1, despite which he was given 1



mark, although entitled to none, a fact that remained uncontroverted even during the course of arguments, thus even mentioning of 2 marks in Annexure P5 as categorically explained in the additional reply dated 15.11.2023 filed by respondent No.4 having been prepared by the clerical staff of the college only to facilitate the selection committee, cannot give him any benefit.

4. Insofar as 13 marks instead of 14 for publication are concerned as stated in para 11-D of the petition, which respondent No.4 responded by specifically stating in the aforesaid additional reply that the selection committee did not find that the petitioner submitted the full paper in the conference proceedings, as such no marks were given for the same. Similarly there being not a research paper, marks were not granted for the same as well. Moreover, the Indian Journal of Material Sciences also ceased to be the Journal. It was after going through every certificate of the candidates that marks were given, which the learned counsel for the petitioner was unable to refute.

5. The petitioner's assertion of an unjust difference in interview marks being unfounded, even otherwise, Writ Court cannot act as an appellate authority to reevaluate the comparative merit of candidates in an oral interview, as the Selection Committee's assessment is based on overall performance as held in CWP-26842-2013 titled as **Lalit Kumar vs. State of Punjab**, decided on 20.12.2016.

6. The sheet anchor contentions raised on behalf of the petitioner being contrary to record and he having obtained lesser marks than respondent No.5 in adherence to the uniform criteria consistently



CWP-8552-2017 (O&M)

-3-

maintained, is sufficient enough for this Court to conclude that the petition lacks merit and is thus dismissed.

20.02.2025

parveen kumar

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

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