



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

111 and 112

CWP No. 29409 of 2024
Date of Decision: 11.02.2025

Vikas Jangra

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondent(s)

AND

CWP No. 29578 of 2024

Jyoti

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. K.D.S. Hooda, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. By this common order, two writ petitions i.e. CWP Nos. 29409 and 29578 of 2024 are hereby adjudicated as issues involved and prayer sought in all the petitions are common. For the sake of convenience and with the consent of parties, the facts are borrowed from CWP No. 29409 of 2024.

2. The petitioner through instant petition filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to consider him under BC-A category instead of Scheduled Caste category.

3. The petitioner as per Common Eligibility Test, 2022 (CET) evolved



application form, he was supposed to declare his category. The application form was further required to be supported with BC-A certificate. The BC-A certificate bears *Parivar Pehchan Number* (PPN). As BC-A certificate bears PPN, the authorities have right to access *Parivar Pehchan Patra* (PPP). The petitioner in his application form disclosed his category. Not only this, he filed correct documents alongwith application form. He was issued admit card with respect to Group-C disclosing his category as SC whereas for Group-D he was considered as BC-A. The respondent declared result of CET. The petitioner for Group-C was considered as SC candidate whereas for Group-D was considered as BC-A. He made representation to respondent to correct his category. He was short listed for written test which was conducted pursuant to Advertisement No.1/2022 dated 17.06.2022. He secured more marks in the written test than last selected candidates under SC category as well as BC-A category. His candidature has been rejected on the ground that he belongs to BC-A category whereas his name figures in SC category.

4. Mr. Hooda submits that petitioner has secured more marks than last selected candidate in SC as well as BC-A category for Group-C post. He has been denied post under SC as well as BC-A category. There is no lapse on his part. The respondent is not claiming that he had mis-reported in his application form.

5. *Per contra*, Mr. Sharma submits that petitioner was given opportunity to correct his particulars. The said opportunity was not availed by petitioner. Thus, he is not entitled to post of Constable (Group-C).

6. I have heard the arguments and perused the record.

7. From the perusal of application form and PPP (produced during the course of hearing), it is evident that petitioner belongs to BC-A category. He



had correctly reported in his application form and uploaded correct documents while filing application for CET as well as written test pursuant to advertisement. There is no lapse on his part. There seems some technical glitch which transposed his candidature from BC-A to SC for Group-C. In CWP-29578-2024, the petitioner was transposed from BC-B to BC-A. There was no lapse on the part of petitioners. Thus, they cannot be denied post despite they having qualified CET and being meritorious in written test. Had petitioners declared incorrect category or uploaded incorrect documents in support of their category, the situation could be different.

8. In the wake of above discussion and findings, instant petitions deserve to be allowed and accordingly allowed. The respondents are hereby directed to consider petitioners in their own category. Let the needful be done within two months from today.

9. Before parting with the judgment, I would hasten to add that there may be technical glitch which transposed petitioners from one category to another, however, there may be intentional human intervention to achieve ulterior motives. This aspect needs to be examined by recruiting agency so that the same event may not occur in future.

11.02.2025
shivani

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes