



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

**CWP-25933 of 2025
Date of decision: 02.09.2025**

ANUJ DAHIYA

....Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, JUDGE**

Present:- Mr. Mohit Rathee, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Ms. Harpriya Khaneka, Advocate for respondent no. 2.
Mr. Nitin Kaushal, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.
Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

1. The petitioner, who is an aspirant for appointment to the post of Additional District & Sessions Judge in the cadre of Superior Judicial Service in the State of Haryana under the 25% direct quota reserved for the Bar, for which, an advertisement was issued, vide notification No.112 Gaz.I/V.I.F.2 dated 01.06.2025 (Annexure P-1), wherein one of the conditions, contained in Clause 10.9 was to the following effect:-

Clause 10.9

*Any application without attaching proper photograph and without signature **on each page** of the application form will be summarily rejected.*

2. The petitioner's candidature for the said recruitment/appointment has been rejected on the ground that he did not append his signatures on each page of the application, as mandated under Clause 10.9 of the said advertisement.



3. We have heard learned counsel for the rival parties and find that Clause 10.9, in clear terms, mandated that each page of the application ought to be signed by the candidates. The expression “**on each page**” was emphasized by specifically employing those words in bold.

4. In competitive examination, the terms of advertisement/syllabus are sacrosanct and any deviation therefrom on the ground of sympathy or compassion cannot be made. [**Please See:- N.T. Devin Katti and others Versus Karnataka Public Service Commission, (1990) 3 Supreme Court Cases 157 (Para No. 11); State of Bihar and others Versus Madhu Kant Ranjan and another, (2021) 17 Supreme Court Cases 141 (Para No. 11); Suresh Kumar Lalit Kumar Patel and others Versus State of Gujarat and others, (2023) 19 Supreme Court Cases 596, (Para Nos. 23 & 24)]**

5. In view of the above, we are not inclined to interfere in the present petition by upholding the decision taken by the High Court, rejecting the application of the petitioner for appointment to the post of Additional District & Sessions Judge in the cadre of Superior Judicial Service in the State of Haryana, which is neither arbitrary nor unlawful.

6. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

02.09.2025

Kamal Gandhi

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