



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

148

CWP-5523-2026

Date of Decision: 20.03.2026

NAVEEN KUMAR

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Ankur Goyat, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms. Svaneel Jaswal, Addl. A.G. Haryana

Mr. K.K. Gupta, Advocate for respondent No.2-Board

Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate for respondent-Commission

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent No.2 to complete his biometric verification process and declare result of HTET-2024.

2. On 06.03.2026, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“Learned counsel for the Board submits that due to mismatch in the petitioner’s biometric, his thumb impression has been sent to the handwriting expert for manual verification, whose report is awaited. Accordingly, declaration of the HTET 2024 result will take some time. He seeks two weeks’ time on that account.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that closing date for submission of application form for the post of PGT Computer Science pursuant to advertisement

23/2026 is 09.03.2026. In case the petitioner is not permitted to apply, he will suffer an irreparable loss. 3. Adjourned to 20.03.2026. 4. In the meanwhile, the Commission is directed to provisionally accept the petitioner's application form for the post in question, provided he submits the same to the Secretary before 09.03.2026."

3. Learned counsel for the respondent No.2-Board submits that as per verification report there is no difference between biometric and physical signatures. The claim of petitioner is justified. The respondent has declared petitioner's result and he has qualified.
4. Learned counsel for the respondent No.3-Commission submits that petitioner's application was provisionally accepted and his eligibility certificate would be considered in accordance with law.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioner agrees to the aforesaid statements.
6. In the wake of statement of both sides, the petition stands disposed of. This Court is sanguine that respondent while considering petitioner's eligibility certificate would keep in mind that there was no lapse on his part and delay occurred on account of inaction on the part of respondent No.2-Board.
7. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

March 20, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No