



112

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

CWP-27062-2025

Date of decision: 15.09.2025

Vanshika Dhanda alias Paramjeet Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Ms. Puja Chopra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Arora, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for setting aside the order dated 08.08.2025 (Annexure P-33) passed by respondent No.4 and further for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to allocate station to the petitioner and allowed her to join duties pursuant to revised result-cum-merit list dated 05.10.2023 (Annexure P-17).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner has participated in the recruitment process for the post of Clerk (Legal) in terms of the advertisement dated 29.06.2022 (Annexure P-6). The petitioner has categorically mentioned her name as 'Vanshika Dhanda' daughter of Mohinder Singh and Manjit Kaur. She has also submitted her educational qualification during the scrutiny and verification. The petitioner has changed her name after getting married and as a spinster she was carrying her previous name as 'Paramjeet Kaur' as discernible from certificates (Annexures P-7 and



P-10, respectively). The petitioner succeeded in selection process, however, during verification, her candidature was rejected on the ground that petitioner's name as Vanshika Dhanda has not been mentioned in her testimonials submitted by her. She further submits that the petitioner has provided multiple documents to verify the change in her name including affidavit, PAN Card, Aadhar Card and newspaper publication (Annexures P-19 to P-21 & P-24, respectively). However, without pointing any other ineligibility, the claim of the petitioner has been rejected arbitrarily. She further relies upon the judgment of Madras High Court passed in 'K.Barida Beevi Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu rep. By its Secretary, School Department, Fort St. George, Chennai and others' W.P.(MD) No.272 of 2021 and W.M.P.(MD) Nos.211, 213 & 214 of 2021 decided on 11.02.2021 and submits that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the aforementioned judgment and the petitioner intends to get her name published in the Government Gazette as a conclusive proof of change in name and thereafter, she being fully eligible is required to be considered for the post of Clerk (Legal) as she is higher in merit than the last selected candidate and further, one post is lying unconsumed.

3. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submits that since there are two different names in the application form and in the certificates submitted by the petitioner, her candidature was not processed. However, he could not point out any other ineligibility with regard to petitioner's candidature except her change in name.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the records, it transpires that the petitioner has participated in the recruitment process under her name as changed after marriage i.e. Vanshika Dhanda.



The petitioner has furnished adequate and valid documentary evidence to establish the change of name. The rejection of her candidature solely on the ground of discrepancy in the name, without any other ineligibility, appears to be arbitrary. In view of the above, the petitioner ought to be given an opportunity to rectify the said discrepancy and her candidature be considered in accordance with the merit and relevant rules. Reliance in this regard can be placed on the judgment rendered by the Madras High Court in ***K.Barida Beevi (supra)*** and the following observation was made:-

'6. When a citizen of this country intends to have their names changed, the procedure prescribed for adopting the new name is by having the name published in Government Gazette. The petitioner herein and her father, had embraced Islam, prior to the year 1997 and therefore, they thought it fit to have their names changed. Accordingly, such change of names were properly published in Government Gazette, which becomes a conclusive proof of change of their names.

7. The counter affidavit seems to state that the petitioner has not taken steps to have her name and her father's name rectified in the school records. I am not in agreement with such stand taken by the second respondent. The very purpose of declaring new names in the Government Gazette only to establish that the old names have to be rectified to the new names and the Government Gazette becomes the supporting documents to any other testimonials which carries their old names. As such when the school testimonials carrying the petitioner's old name are used for verification, it should be accompanied with copy of the Government of Tamil Nadu Gazette carrying the old and new names of the petitioner as well as her father. The second respondent is bound to take cognizance of the change of her name and her father's name and thereafter proceed with the selection process. This procedure has not been followed by the second respondent. Consequently, the petitioner herein would be entitled for appointment since no other ineligibility has been pointed out by the second respondent with regard to the petitioner's candidature.'



CWP-27062-2025

-4-

5. In view of the above observation, the present writ petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 08.08.2025 (Annexure P-33) is hereby set aside. Further, liberty is granted to the petitioner to apply for getting her name published in the official gazette as a conclusive proof within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Pursuant to furnishing of the gazette publication, the respondents are directed to consider the case of the petitioner and take appropriate decision.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

15.09.2025*Neha*

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