



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

CWP-26666-2025

Date of Decision: 08.09.2025

PANKAJ KUMAR AHLAWAT

...PETITIONER

Vs.

HARYANA STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

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

Present:- Dr. Pankaj Nanhera, Advocate and
Mr. Paramvir Singh Doon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Puneet Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)

1. Following prayers are made by the petitioner in the instant writ petition:

“a) Issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the result dated 28.06.2019 advertisement (Annexure no. P-5) 1/2019 dated 07.01.2019 (Annexure P-1) as the said result has been declared by taking into dated consideration the notification 11.06.2019 bearing no. CS Notification no. G.S.R. 25/ Const./ Art. 309/ 2019 dated 11.06.2019 (Annexure P-8) for the purpose of selection of the petitioner as well as others and the said notification has already been quashed by this Hon'ble High Court dated vide judgment 22.05.2025 (Annexure P-9) passed in CWP No. 16904 of 2021 with retrospective effect as it has been held that grant of 10 marks for socio-economic criteria is unconstitutional

and has been declared ultra-vires but still the respondents have not quashed the result dated 28.06.2019 (Annexure P-5) qua the selection of the petitioner against the advertisement no. 1/2019 dated 07.01.2019 (Annexure P-1);

b) Issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the notification no. G.S.R. 10/Const./Art.309/2018 dated 13.02.2018 (Annexure P-7) being ultra 1/2019 vires as the advertisement no. dated 07.01.2019 (Annexure P-1) was based on the above mentioned notification no. G.S.R. 10/Const./Art. 309/2018 dated 13.02.2018 (Annexure P-7) which also deals with the similar issue of awarding 10 marks on the basis of socio economic criteria and experience being unconstitutional as same is in the violation of Articles 14, 15 and 16 of the Constitution of India, however, the result was declared on the basis of notification no. G.S.R.25/Const./Art.309/2019 dated 11.06.2019 (Annexure P-8) and the same has already been declared unconstitutional and has already been quashed and furthermore, the similar issue of awarding 10 marks on the basis of socio-economic criteria has already quashed being unconstitutional by this Hon'ble High Court in CWP-1563-2024 (Annexure P-10) and has been upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP (C) No. 13275-13277;

c) Issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to revise the final result dated 28.06.2019 Annexure P-5) without considering the 10 marks awarded on the basis of socio. economic criteria based on the notification no. 309/2019 G.S.R. 25/Const./Art. dated 11.06.2019 as the same has been quashed and has been declared ultra vires by this Hon'ble High Court vide judgment dated 22.05.2025 (Annexure P 9);

d) Any other order or direction, which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and in the circumstances of the present case;

*e) **To dispense**, with the requirement of certified copies of the documents attached as the annexures with this petition;*

*f) **To dispense**, with the official translation of the annexure attached with the writ petition;*

*g) **To dispense**, with the requirement of service of notice of motion of the writ petition on the respondents;*

*h) **To allow**, the cost of this writ petition to the petitioner”*

2. According to the petitioner the criteria of fixing additional marks for socio-economic criteria has been specifically disapproved by this Court in writ petition being CWP-16904-2021 *vide* judgment dated 22.05.2025, as such, the appointments already made against the Advertisement No.1/2019 dated 07.01.2019 (*for short*, ‘Advertisement’) be quashed.

3. At the very outset, we may note that the writ petition has been filed in the year 2025 to challenge the appointments which have already been made against the said Advertisement. So far as the judgment delivered by this Court in CWP-16904-2021 is concerned, we are informed that certain clarification applications have been filed which are being examined by the Competent Court. However, we may note that none of the persons, who have been appointed pursuant to the said

Advertisement has been impleaded as a party respondent in the present case. Even otherwise, no justification has been shown for filing of the writ petition almost six years after the Advertisement was published. Merely because in other writ petitions, an order has been passed by the Co-ordinate Bench interfering with the award of marks for socio-economic criteria a fresh writ petition would not be entertained now after such a long lapse of time particularly when the affected persons are not before the Court.

4. In that view of the matter, the instant writ petition is dismissed.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 08th, 2025
Rahul Joshi

1. Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
2. Whether Reportable	Yes/No