

2025:PHHC:156837



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

110

Date of decision: 13.11.2025

1. CWP-32977-2025 (O&M)

Aashish Kumar and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

2. CWP-33004-2025 (O&M)

Pushpa Kumari Yadav

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in both the cases.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl. A.G., Haryana
for respondents No.1 to 3 in CWP-32977-2025.

Mr. Divyansh Shukla, Advocate
for Mr. Sukhdeep Singh Parmar, Advocate
for respondent No.4 in CWP-32977-2025.

Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.4 in CWP-33004-2025.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Vide this common order, I intend to dispose of CWP Nos.32977 and 33004 of 2025, as common questions of law and facts are involved for adjudication. For the sake of convenience, facts are taken from CWP-32977-2025.

2025:PHHC:156837



2. Prayer in the writ petition (CWP-32977-2025) filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus*, for direction respondent No.2 to recompute/revised and republish the final result for Category No.26. Further a writ of *certiorari* has been sought, for quashing and setting-aside the final result dated 03.09.2020 and remaining final result dated 17.05.2021 (Annexure P-4) for the post of Clerk declared by respondent No.2 in respect of Category No.26. Another prayer has been made to direct the respondents not to promote the candidates/clerks who were appointed along with petitioners No.2 to 7 for the post of Clerk in pursuance of the advertisement No.05/2019 and revise the result and prepare the fresh merit-cum-seniority list and also refix the all consequential benefits with similarly placed candidates and consider the candidates for promotion to the next post as per the merit of revised result.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners had applied and participated in the recruitment process for the posts of LDC and Clerk under Advertisement Nos.11/2019 and 05/2019, which incorporated the Socio-Economic Criteria and Experience (SECE) framework. The final results declared on 30.04.2021 for LDC and 17.05.2021 for Clerk included 10 bonus marks awarded under the SECE framework. The constitutional validity of the SECE framework was subsequently challenged in the case of *Neeraj vs. State of Haryana and another*, passed in CWP-16904-2021, whereby

2025:PHHC:156837



the Division Bench of this Court, vide judgment dated 22.05.2025, struck down the SECE framework as unconstitutional and violative of Articles 14, 15 and 16 of the Constitution of India. The Court further directed the State and its recruiting agencies to revise and rectify all selection processes affected by the application of SECE marks. Despite serving a legal notice on 06.10.2025, no action has been taken by the respondents to revise the results.

4. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the private respondents submit that the entire selection process has been set-aside with a further direction to revise the result. The respondents are in process of revision of result and if the petitioners fall within the revised list of selected candidates, they would be offered appointment letters.

5. In view of the above, both the present petitions are disposed of with a direction to the respondents to assign the seniority to the petitioners strictly in terms of the statutory rules, as per the merit list.

6. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

13.11.2025
yakub

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