IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No. 16958/2026
Decided on: 01.10.2026

Manoj Kumar **…..Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors. **.....Respondents**

Coram
Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the Petitioner: Mr. Raju Ram Rahi, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. L.N. Sharma, Additional Advocate General, for respondents No.1 & 2.

Mr. Vishwajeet Singh, Advocate, for respondents No.3 & 4.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Grievance of the petitioner was noticed in the order dated 28.09.2026 passed in this writ petition as under: -

> *"Notice. Mr. Rajat Choudhary, learned Assistant Advocate General and Mr. Vishwajeet Singh, learned counsel, accept notice on behalf of respondents No.1 & 2 and 3 & 4, respectively.*
>
> *The case set up by the petitioner is that: - he had applied for the post of Teacher Sociology under the advertisement issued by respondents No. 3 & 4 on 16.04.2026 under the General-EWS category; As per the results declared vide Annexure P-14, the cut-off marks for the aforesaid category were mentioned as 55; Annexure P-15 shows the petitioner to have scored 55 marks and in waiting list; Petitioner's case is that he has accordingly preferred a representation at Annexure P-16 to respondent No. 3, stating*

---

[1] **Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.**

that, as per the answer key displayed by respondents No. 3 and 4, on verification, his marks would come out to be 56.

Let respondents No. 3 and 4 look into the grievance of the petitioner raised in this writ petition as well as in his representation at Annexure P-16 dated 05.09.2026. Instructions be placed on record on the next date.

*List on **01.10.2026**."*

2. Pursuant to above, learned counsel for respondents No. 3 & 4-Himachal Pradesh Rajya Chayan Aayog has placed on record detailed instructions dated 30.09.2026. In terms of these instructions:-

- Computer-Based Test, in which the petitioner appeared for the post of Teacher (Sociology) under the General (EWS) category, was conducted in a single shift, wherein the questions were jumbled and arranged in four different sets, namely A, B, C and D;
- Condition No. 14(ii) of the advertisement specifically provided that the provisional answer key would be uploaded on the official website. Candidates would be given seven days to submit objections. On examination of the objections by a panel of subject experts, the result would be finalized on the basis of the revised/final answer key. Thus, the provisional answer key was expressly made subject to review and revision and was not to be made the basis for final determination of the candidates' marks.
- The petitioner claims that he secured 56 marks, but his claim is made on the basis of the provisional answer key. The

said claim is not sustainable, as, on the basis of the objections received to the provisional answer key and on consideration of the same, the final answer key was also published by the respondents. The petitioner secured 55 marks on the basis of the final answer key. Accordingly, he was placed at serial number 1 in the waiting panel of the General (EWS) category.

No other point was urged for the petitioner.

In view of the explanation given by respondents No. 3 and 4, the claim of the petitioner to have scored 56 marks is not sustainable. The petition is accordingly dismissed. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also to stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

01st October, 2026
rohit