



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

**CWP-27254-2025
Date of decision: 19.09.2025**

SANGEETA KUMARI

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Ms. Amrita Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Dev Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Ms. Harpriya Khanera, Advocate for HPSC.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. This civil writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of 'Certiorari' for quashing the impugned advertisement No.18/2025 dated 08.08.2025 (Annexure P-3) and the consequent recruitment process for selection to the post of assistant District Attorney to be conducted by the respondent Commission through examination, insofar as it mandates the provision of Aadhaar number for registration and Biometric Verification.

2. Ms. Harpriya Khanera, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent-HPSC and filed affidavit of Mukesh Kumar Ahuja, Secretary Haryana Public Service Commission, which is taken on record, wherein the attention of this Court has been drawn to para-6 which reads as under :-

“That so far as the apprehension of the petitioner that since she has not submitted her Aadhar Number therefore



her application form will not be accepted and her biometric attendance would not be taken, it is submitted that as already mentioned above the petitioner has herself admitted in Para No.5(iv) of the writ petition that she has successfully submitted her application form (P-4). Therefore, it means that her application form has already been accepted. So far as the issue of biometric attendance is concerned, it is submitted that point No.6 is simply an enabling provision. The biometric fingerprints of all the candidates are taken at the exam centre. In case of any doubt the Commission can verify the credentials of the candidate with Aadhar database. However, it does not mean that candidates who have applied by using their mobile number would not be allowed to take exam or their attendance would not be marked. Thus the entire writ petition is based on false notions and erroneous assumptions of the petitioner and hence it is liable to be dismissed with heavy costs.”

2. Having gone through the contents of this affidavit, Ms. Amrita Garg, Advocate for the petitioner is duly satisfied and do not press the petition any further. In the light of the statement and above stand taken by the respondent, the present petition stands accordingly disposed of.

3. Ordered accordingly.

19.09.2025
monika

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes /No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes /No