



109

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

**CWP-25398-2025 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 02.09.2025**

PAWAN KUMAR AND ORS**.....PETITIONER(S)****VERSUS****HARYANA STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION****.....RESPONDENT(S)****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Ankur Sidhar, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The petitioner has approached this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the application of “Normalization Formula” dated 04.11.2022 (Annexure P-6) while preparing the result of CET-2025. The grievance of the petitioner is that the normalization process adopted is ineffective on account of disparity between the difficulty levels of various shifts.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends further that no provision has been made to normalize the marks with the earlier CET-2022 result dated 10.01.2023 which, under Clause 7(ix) of the notification dated 05.05.2022 issued by the Department of Human Resources Department, Haryana Government, remains valid up to 10.01.2026.

It is further submitted that the respondents are bound to ensure that the marks obtained in CET-2025 are normalized not only *inter se* across shifts but also with the earlier result of CET-2022.

Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the present petition is wholly premature while pointing out that the result of CET-2025 has not yet been declared. Further, Clause 10.3 of Advertisement No. 1/2025 dated 26.05.2025 authorizes the Commission to adopt the normalization method/process as deemed appropriate if the examination is conducted in multiple shifts.

Having considered the matter, this Court finds merit in the objection raised by the respondents. The normalization formula is only an enabling process for evaluation, and its precise impact on the petitioner or any candidate can be assessed only once the result is declared. At this stage, the challenge is merely speculative and pre-emptive in nature.

This court is mindful of the settled principle that writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of Constitution Of India is discretionary and cannot be invoked in anticipation of a grievance which may or may not materialize. Unless and until the normalization formula is applied to the actual CET-2025 result and the petitioner demonstrates concrete prejudice, no enforceable cause of action arises. Furthermore, the Commission has flexibility to adopt any suitable Normalization method/process, judicial review of such technical processes in recruitment must be exercised with circumspection, and interference is warranted only where arbitrariness, malafides or manifest illegality is established none of which is demonstrated at this stage.

In light of the above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the writ petition is premature and does not warrant interference.

Accordingly, the civil writ petition is dismissed.

02.09.2025

anuradha

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No