



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

135

LPA-2358-2025(O&M)

Date of Decision : August 20, 2025

PANKAJ SHARMA AND ANOTHER

.....Appellants

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present : Mr. Abhijeet Singh Rawaley, Advocate for the appellants.

Mr. Puneet Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate for the respondent-HPSC.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. This appeal arises out of judgment passed by the learned Single Judge refusing to interfere in the appellants' writ petition wherein final answer key dated 30.05.2025 was published. The learned Single Judge has noticed that 11 questions were in the provisional answer key published by the respondents. The learned Single Judge has taken note of the fact that objections received against key answers were sent to Subject Experts and on the basis of their advice/opinion, final result of test was pronounced by the respondents while issuing the final answer key. The observations made by the learned Single Judge in paragraphs No.2 and 3 of the judgment are reproduced as under:-

“2. Learned counsel for the Commission contends that screening test was held on 04.05.2025, and its result was finally

declared on 30.05.2025. Prior thereto, provisional answer key was uploaded by the Commission on 05.05.2025 inviting objections from the candidates. The objections received were sent to the subject experts and as per their advice/opinion, the final result of the test was prepared and announced along with the final answer key. He also contends that the candidates shortlisted as per the final result appeared in the Subject Knowledge Test, which was held on 06.07.2025.

3. As per the undisputed position, the final result of screening test was declared on 30.05.2025. The next stage of selection has also been crossed by holding of Subject Knowledge Test on 06.07.2025; but the petitioners never approached this Court prior thereto. Besides, objection to the questions were examined by the subject experts, and based upon their advice the answer key has been finalised. Accordingly, there is no ground to entertain the petition.”

2. In the present appeal, the learned counsel for the appellants has questioned the observations of the learned Single Judge on the ground that there was infact no application of mind to the merits of the objections raised by the candidates to the disputed questions. Taking note of such contention, this Court passed the following order on 12.08.2025:-

“Adjourned to 20.08.2025, in order to enable the learned counsel for the Commission to clarify that objections raised by the appellants to the provisional answer key, within the time permitted in the Notification, has been dealt with.”

3. Today when the matter is taken up, the learned counsel for the respondent-HPSC has produced the opinion of the Subject Experts in a sealed cover. We have perused the opinion of the Subject Experts, consisting of three distinguished Professors of University. They have all authenticated the correct answers. Once that be the position, we would not

be justified in embarking upon an exercise to determine correctness or otherwise of such opinion of Experts in view of the law laid down by the Supreme Court in Paras 31 and 32 of the judgment passed in ***Ran Vijay and others Vs. State of U.P. and others, 2018(2) SCC 357***. The observations made by Hon'ble the Supreme Court are reproduced as under:-

31. On our part we may add that sympathy or compassion does not play any role in the matter of directing or not directing re-evaluation of an answer sheet. If an error is committed by the examination authority, the complete body of candidates suffers. The entire examination process does not deserve to be derailed only because some candidates are disappointed or dissatisfied or perceive some injustice having been caused to them by an erroneous question or an erroneous answer. All candidates suffer equally, though some might suffer more but that cannot be helped since mathematical precision is not always possible. This Court has shown one way out of an impasse – exclude the suspect or offending question.

32. It is rather unfortunate that despite several decisions of this Court, some of which have been discussed above, there is interference by the Courts in the result of examinations. This places the examination authorities in an unenviable position where they are under scrutiny and not the candidates. Additionally, a massive and sometimes prolonged examination exercise concludes with an air of uncertainty. While there is no doubt that candidates put in a tremendous effort in preparing for an examination, it must not be forgotten that even the examination authorities put in equally great efforts to successfully conduct an examination. The

enormity of the task might reveal some lapse at a later stage, but the Court must consider the internal checks and balances put in place by the examination authorities before interfering with the efforts put in by the candidates who have successfully participated in the examination and the examination authorities. The present appeals are a classic example of the consequence of such interference where there is no finality to the result of the examinations even after a lapse of eight years. Apart from the examination authorities even the candidates are left wondering about the certainty or otherwise of the result of the examination – whether they have passed or not; whether their result will be approved or disapproved by the Court; whether they will get admission in a college or University or not; and whether they will get recruited or not. This unsatisfactory situation does not work to anybody's advantage and such a state of uncertainty results in confusion being worse confounded. The overall and larger impact of all this is that public interest suffers.

4. The arguments raised by the learned counsel for the appellants that the Subject Experts were not independent or that they had not examined the objections is an argument which is noticed only to be rejected. There is no allegation of malafide nor we are inclined to think that 3 Professors of University would act in a manner inconsistent with their academic experience and stature. There is otherwise no reason to suspect their opinion. The appellants' contention that a team of subject experts be formed by this Court to analyse the objections and give its opinion cannot be accepted for the asking.

5. In such view of the matter, the present Letters Patent Appeal is dismissed.

6. All pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

August 20, 2025
ajaysharma

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No