

126

2026-PHHC-036874-DB



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

**LPA-649-2026 (O&M)**

**Date of decision : 10.03.2026**

**Balwinder Kaur**

**...Appellant**

**Vs.**

**State of Punjab and others**

**...Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Mohit Garg, Advocate  
for the appellant.

\*\*\*

**DEEPAK MANCHANDA, J.**

**CM-1626-LPA-2026**

This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 73 days in filing the appeal.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed.

Delay of 73 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

**Main case**

Through this Intra Court Appeal, the appellant has challenged the impugned judgment dated 14.11.2025, vide which the writ petition filed by appellant was dismissed.

2. The facts, as emanating from the pleadings in the present appeal, are that the appellant had applied for the post of Sub-Inspector (SI) under the Sports Category. As per the terms and conditions of the advertisement, a candidate was required to secure a minimum of 50% marks in the Sports Trial.

Since 20 marks were earmarked for the said trial, each candidate was required to obtain at least 10 marks. However, the appellant secured only 09 marks and, consequently, her candidature was rejected. Aggrieved by the said rejection, the appellant approached this Court by filing CWP No. 12612 of 2017, which came to be dismissed vide the impugned judgment dated 14.11.2025 on the ground that the appellant had failed to secure the minimum qualifying marks in the Sports Trial as prescribed under the terms and conditions of the advertisement. Now, the appellant has preferred the present intra-court appeal assailing the aforesaid impugned judgment dated 14.11.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is an International Kabaddi player and, in response to Advertisement No. 1/2016 (Sports) dated 23.11.2016, applied for the post of Female Sub-Inspector (Sports) in Kabaddi (National Style), against which only one post was available. It is further submitted that the respondent-authorities, in terms of Standing Order No. 14 of 2016 issued under the administrative directions of the Director General of Police, Punjab, prescribed a composite merit evaluation for recruitment under the 3% sports quota, comprising Sports Trial (20 marks), Sports Achievements (25 marks), and Interview/Personality Test (5 marks).

4. Learned counsel contends that although the appellant appeared in the Sports Trial on the scheduled date, her marks were not disclosed at the spot/venue, despite the requirement of transparency and the availability of an appeal mechanism under the Standing Order. It is further submitted that the appellant secured 9 out of 20 marks in the Sports Trial and full 25 out of 25 marks in Sports Achievements, thereby obtaining 34 out of 50 marks prior to the interview stage. However, her candidature was rejected solely on the

ground that she did not secure the minimum qualifying 50% marks in the Sports Trial.

5. Learned counsel further argues that the said approach is erroneous, as the recruitment process was based on composite merit and not merely on the Sports Trial marks. It is also contended that the reserved post in Kabaddi remained vacant despite the availability of a meritorious candidate, a fact which has not been duly appreciated by the learned Single Judge. Additionally, it is urged that rejection of the appellant's candidature solely based on Sports Trial marks defeats the very object of the Punjab Recruitment of Sportsmen Rules, 1988, which are intended to promote sports excellence. Accordingly, learned counsel for the appellant prays for setting aside the impugned judgment.

6. Heard.

7. The findings recorded by the learned Single Judge are reproduced here below:-

*“From the perusal of record, it is evident that petitioner could not secure 50% Marks in Sports Trial. She had applied under Sports Quota and Sports Trial was indispensable and integral part of the selection process. This Court cannot tinker with criteria prescribed by Recruitment Board. This Court has no power to direct respondent to ignore selection criteria. There is no violation of fundamental or vested right of petitioner on the part of respondent.”*

8. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the appellant has emphasized that the respondent-authorities did not communicate the result to the appellant on the same day and that no opportunity was afforded to her to avail the statutory remedy of appeal. However, this contention does not carry

much weight, as no material has been placed on record to substantiate the same or to persuade this Court to take a contrary view. Furthermore, the learned Single Judge dismissed the writ petition on the ground that the appellant had failed to achieve the prescribed benchmark of 50% marks in the Sports Trial, which formed an essential component of the evaluation scheme.

9. We have also perused the Punjab Recruitment of Sportsmen Rules, 1988 as well as the judgment relied upon by learned counsel for the appellant, namely *Dev Gupta vs. PEC University of Technology and others, 2023 (6) MLJ 195*. Upon a careful examination of the Rules of 1988, there is no provision which permits relaxation or disregard of the prescribed minimum benchmark of 50% marks in the Sports Trial for determining eligibility. Even otherwise, a bare perusal of the aforesaid judgment shows that the same does not advance the case of the appellant, as the facts therein are clearly distinguishable and not applicable to the present case.

10. In view of the foregoing discussion, we are of the considered opinion that the learned Single Judge has rightly dismissed the writ petition, as the appellant failed to secure the minimum prescribed 50% marks in the Sports Trial. In light thereof, no perversity, illegality, or infirmity can be found in the impugned judgment warranting interference by this Court

11. Consequently, present Intra Court appeal stands dismissed.

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)  
JUDGE

(SUVIR SEHGAL)  
JUDGE

10.03.2026

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :  
Whether Reportable :

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
| Yes | No |