



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

109

CWP-10603-2026

Date of Decision : **April 08, 2026**

AYUSHIKA UPADHYAY

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA

Present : Mr. Ankit Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA, J. (Oral)

1. In the present writ petition, the petitioner is praying for grant of one additional opportunity to appear for scrutiny of documents, as she could not appear on the scheduled dates i.e. 17.03.2026 and 18.03.2026.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the respondents issued an advertisement in the year 2025 advertising the posts of Constables in District Police and Armed Police Cadre. The petitioner belongs to general category. The petitioner duly applied in pursuance to the abovementioned advertisement and appeared in the written examination held in the month of May 2025. After qualifying the abovesaid test, the petitioner also appeared in Physical Measurement Test on 12.10.2025. The petitioner was successful in the abovesaid test. In the first merit list issued by the respondents, the name of the petitioner did not figure, however, in the supplementary merit list, the name of the petitioner was mentioned. The supplementary merit list was duly uploaded on the website of the respondents. The respondents, through the website, issued a notice dated 14.03.2026 calling the candidates for the purpose of scrutiny of documents on 17.03.2026 and 18.03.2026.

It transpires that the candidates were also informed through e-mail and SMS, which

is clear from Annexure P-4. However, the petitioner did not appear before the Scrutiny Committee for the purpose of scrutiny of documents on 17.03.2026 and 18.03.2026. As the petitioner did not appear before the Scrutiny Committee for the purpose of scrutiny of documents, the name of the petitioner was not recommended for appointment to the post of Constable in pursuance to the advertisement issued in the year 2025.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that although the petitioner was informed through e-mail about the scheduled dates in regard to the scrutiny of documents, however, taking into consideration that a short notice period was given, the petitioner could not appear before the Scrutiny Committee for the purpose of scrutiny of documents. As such, the respondents be directed to permit the petitioner again to appear before the Scrutiny Committee for the purpose of scrutiny of documents.

4. The learned State counsel submits that Annexure P-4 i.e. notice dated 14.03.2026 was duly uploaded on the website of the respondents wherein, the names of the shortlisted candidates were mentioned. He further submits that a perusal of Annexure P-4 would also show that it was therein mentioned that the candidates were also be informed through e-mail and SMS and the candidates were to download the admit cards. The learned State counsel further submits that the petitioner was duly informed, however, the petitioner did not appear before the Scrutiny Committee for the purpose of scrutiny of documents on 17.03.2026 and 18.03.2026, as such, the respondents have rightly not considered the petitioner for appointment on the post of Constable.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties at length, a perusal of the facts of the present case would show that there is no dispute that Annexure P-4 i.e. notice dated 14.03.2026 was uploaded on the website of the respondents and the petitioner was also informed about the scheduled dates for the purpose of scrutiny

of documents i.e. 17.03.2026 and 18.03.2026. In regard to the contention raised by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that a short notice period was given by the respondents to the candidates as such the petitioner could not appear before the Scrutiny Committee for the purpose of scrutiny of documents on the scheduled dates is concerned, it is not in dispute that the petitioner was informed about the scheduled dates in regard to scrutiny of documents. The assertion made by the learned counsel for the petitioner that short notice period was given by the respondents as such, petitioner could not appear before the Scrutiny Committee for the purpose of scrutiny of documents cannot be accepted as there is no sufficient cause for not appearing before the Scrutiny Committee on the scheduled dates fixed for the purpose of scrutiny of documents. A candidate must act with due diligence. In pursuance to Annexure P-4 dated 14.03.2026, other candidates duly appeared before the Scrutiny Committee for the purpose of scrutiny of documents. If the contention raised by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is to be accepted, the selection process can never be finalised. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that the process of selection has been completed.

6. In view of the abovesaid facts, this Court finds no merit in the present writ petition and, accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)
JUDGE

April 08, 2026
ajaysharma

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