



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

119

LPA-2890-2025(O&M)

Date of Decision : **September 25, 2025**

RAHUL AND ORS

.....Appellants

VERSUS

HARYANA STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION AND ANR

.....Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Ankur Sidhar, Advocate for the appellants.

Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Addl. AG, Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. This Letters Patent Appeal arises out of an order passed by the learned Single Judge dated 02.09.2025, whereby the writ petition filed by the appellants as well as proforma respondent No.2 has been dismissed.
2. The grievance raised before the learned Single Judge was with regard to the applicability of normalization formula dated 04.11.2022 for conducting the CET-2025. The learned Single Judge has noticed the facts and has come to the conclusion that normalization formula is an enabling process for evaluation of answer sheets and its precise impact would be known after the result is declared. The result of exam is not declared, so far.
3. So far as the normalization process is concerned, it has already been recognised as a valid process when examinations are conducted in different shifts, with the object of equalising different questions put to candidates in different shifts.

4. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the normalization process has not been carried out in a fair and transparent manner and, therefore, the judgment of the learned Single Judge requires interference. On this aspect, we do not find any merit in the challenge laid to the judgment of the learned Single Judge inasmuch as the adoption of normalization process in large recruitments where examination is conducted in different shifts is already acknowledged and accepted as a valid process. See:- **“Sanjay Singh & Anr. V. U.P. Public Service Commission, Allahabad & Anr.” (2007) 3 SCC 720 and State of Uttar Pradesh & Ors. Vs. Atul Kumar Dwivedi & Ors., Civil Appeal No. 228 of 2022.** The result of the examination is otherwise not declared, therefore, the learned Single Judge is right in stating that the writ petition, at this stage is wholly pre-mature. Challenge laid to the judgment of the learned Single Judge consequently fails. Other prayers made in this appeal are not pressed by the learned counsel for the appellants.

5. Ordinarily with the dismissal of the appeal, for the reasons aforesaid, the available cause in this appeal would have come to an end. However, there are some disturbing facts, which have been brought to our notice by the State during the course of arguments, which requires narration.

6. The proforma respondent in this appeal, who is petitioner No.1 before the learned Single Judge is alleged to have uploaded certain posts indicating that he was managing the litigation before the High Court. Certain screen shots of social media posts have also been placed before us, which indicates that proforma respondent No.2 has been collecting money by way of QR codes from large number of students. The learned Addl. Advocate

General for the State contends that a large mischief has apparently been played by the proforma respondent so as to castigate the recruitment process and for such purposes, the proforma respondent has also alleged his close association with the affairs of the Court. During the course of arguments, it is also suggested that proforma respondent is in employment of the Court. If that be so, this is a serious matter. Since the entire facts are not before us, we do not intend to make any further observations in that regard. However, this Court also cannot shut its eyes to the facts, which have been placed before us during the course of arguments. In such circumstances, we direct that all documents/photocopies, which have been handed over to the Court during the course of hearing by the State counsel shall be kept in a sealed cover and shall be handed over to the Registrar General of this Court for necessary examination and for appropriate action, as may be warranted in law.

7. Subject to the observations made above, this Letters Patent Appeal fails and is dismissed.

8. All pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

September 25 2025

ajaysharma

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No