



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

115

CWP-23601-2025

Decided On: 21.08.2025

NISHA RANI

....PETITIONER(s)

Versus

HARYANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

....RESPONDENT(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Ritesh Tomar, Advocate with Mr. Pritam Punia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate
for the respondent.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA J.(Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *certiorari* for setting aside the Screening Test result dated 11.07.2025, Annexure P-3, for the post of Assistant Professor (College cadre) Computer Science, in response to advertisement 45/2024.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has objected to correctness of four questions of the Test, i.e., 12, 13, 51 and 65, but without considering the objections the final answer key was uploaded whereby questions 12, 13, and 65 have been deleted and answer to question 51 has been altered. The relevant material regarding correctness of these questions has been placed on record which establishes the deletion or change of answers of these questions is not proper.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent/Commission has filed an affidavit of Mr. Mukesh Kumar Ahuja, Secretary, Haryana Public Service



Commission, dated 20.08.2025, which is taken on record. It is to the following effect:

4. That in terms of clause 6 of the advertisement, which reflected the scheme/pattern for conducting the examination, the Screening test was held on 15.06.2025. After the conduct of screening test, the Commission uploaded the Master Answer Key and called for objections from the candidates vide its announcement dated 16.06.2025. Copy of the announcement inviting objections is attached as Annexure R-1.

5. That the petitioner submitted her objections to four questions no. 12, 13, 51 and 65. Other candidates had also submitted their objections in response to announcement dated 16.06.2025. All the objections received from the candidates (including petitioner) were sent to a committee of subject experts. The final answer key was prepared as per opinion given by the subject experts.

6. That based on the said report, the Commission uploaded the final answer key vide its announcement dated 27.06.2025. Copy of the Final Answer Key uploaded by the Commission vide its Announcement dated 27.06.2025 is attached as Annexure R-2. Perusal of the same would reveal that Q. No. 12, 13 and 65 have been deleted and answer of Q. No. 51 has been changed from 'C' to 'B' in the final answer key. Thus it is clear that the objections submitted by the petitioner and other candidates were duly considered. Thereafter, the Commission declared the result for Screening Test based upon the final answer key for the post in question on 11.07.2025.

7. That it is thus evident that the Commission has acted upon the advice of an expert committee, who are neutral persons having vast experience in the field. All the objections which were received by the Commission within the time frame prescribed vide its announcement dated 16.06.2025 were sent for consideration by the expert Committee and acting upon the same, the expert committee gave its opinion. It is therefore submitted that the allegations levelled in the petition vis-à-vis the factum of

non-consideration of objections is absolutely incorrect and therefore liable to be rejected.

He has also shown the report of subject experts, who have considered objections to the aforementioned questions and opined deletion of questions 12, 13 and 65, and change of answer to question 51. The report has been re-sealed and returned to the learned counsel.

4. Heard.

5. In view of the facts aforementioned, it is apparent that final answer key of the Test has been made as per advice of the independent subject experts tendered after considering the objections received from the candidates, including the ones submitted by the petitioner. The experts hold senior academic positions in a University, and this Court finds no valid ground to differ with the view taken by them against whom no *mala fide* or bias has been alleged. This is in line with law laid down by this Court in CWP-30309-2024, *Amit and others v. State of Haryana and others*.

6. Accordingly, there is no merit in the petition and it stands dismissed.

21.08.2025
Ad

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No