



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

222

CWP-2091-2024

Date of Decision : February 05, 2026

SUNIL KUMAR

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA

Present : Mr. J.S.Jaidka, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. N.P.S.Hira, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Harpreet K. Gill, Advocate for respondents No.4 to 10.

DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA, J. (Oral)

1. In the present writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the impugned selection process in respect to the post of Laboratory Attendant which was advertised in the year 2021 (Annexure P-1). A perusal of the abovesaid selection to the post of Laboratory Attendant was challenged by the petitioner on the basis of giving reference of few candidates, namely, Pawan Kumar, Vandana Sharma, Jagdeep Singh and Gurpreet Singh, who were selected.

2. It is the case of the petitioner in the writ petition that the abovesaid candidates, namely, Pawan Kumar, Vandana Sharma, Jagdeep Singh and Gurpreet Singh could not have been selected, as such, the selection is liable to be quashed.

3. Written statement has been filed by respondent No.5. A perusal of paras No.11 and 12 would show that Pawan Kumar belongs to the Backward Class category whereas, the petitioner belongs to Schedule Caste category as such, it cannot be held that the petitioner is higher in merit than the candidate Pawan Kumar. In respect of the candidate namely Vandana Sharma is concerned, it has been mentioned in the abovesaid paras that she has been given the benefit of age relaxation taking into consideration that she was already working as Junior Lab Helper on contractual basis in Department of Soil Science, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana. As far as the cases of the candidates namely Jagdeep Singh and Gurpreet Singh are concerned, it has been mentioned that they had the requisite experience certificates for the purpose of appointment on the post of Laboratory Attendant and, therefore, they were rightly selected on the abovesaid post.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner was not able to show that the abovesaid candidates mentioned in the preceding paragraph were not eligible to be selected on the post of Laboratory Attendant.

5. In view of the above, this Court finds no merit in the present writ petition. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed.

(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)
JUDGE

February 05, 2026
ajaysharma

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