



CWP-13256-2019

:1:

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

228

**CWP-13256-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision : 05.05.2026**

SHAKUNTALA

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA

Present :- Mr. Prashant Sethi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Chirag Wadhwa, DAG, Haryana.

Deepinder Singh Nalwa, J. (Oral)

1. In the present writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the result (Annexure P-6) to the extent that the name of the petitioner does not figure in the said impugned result. It has also been prayed that the respondents be directed to grant the benefit of 05 marks to the petitioner under the socio-economic criteria and, thereafter, to declare the result of the petitioner and consider her case for appointment to the post of Female Constable (General Duty) in the SC category.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the Haryana Staff Selection Commission, Government of Haryana (hereinafter referred to as “the Commission”) issued an advertisement dated 16.04.2018 (Annexure P-1) inviting online applications for various posts, including 1147 posts of Female Constables (General Duty). The petitioner applied in pursuance to

**CWP-13256-2019**

:2:

the above said advertisement. The written examination was held on 30.12.2018, in which the petitioner duly appeared. The result was declared on 03.03.2019 (Annexure P-5) however, the name of the petitioner did not figure in the above said result declared by the Commission. Aggrieved against the final result, the petitioner filed a writ petition before this Court, being CWP No.4207 of 2019. The above said writ petition was disposed of vide order dated 07.03.2019 with a direction to the respondents to declare the detailed result of the petitioner along with other candidates and upload the same on the website. Subsequently, the result was declared by the Commission and uploaded on the website, whereby the result of the petitioner was reflecting as rejected (Annexure P-6). Aggrieved against the action of respondents in declaring the result of the petitioner as rejected, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that if 05 marks were given to the petitioner under the socio-economic criteria, petitioner would have scored higher marks than the last candidate selected in the category in which the petitioner had applied and as such, the petitioner is entitled to be considered for appointment to the post of Female Constable (General Duty).

4. On the other hand, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent-State submits that the result of the petitioner was not declared on the ground that she had erased/smudged the answer to Question No.72 on the OMR sheet which was in clear violation of the instructions. Accordingly, the OMR sheet could not be evaluated and the candidature of the petitioner was rejected.

**CWP-13256-2019**

:3:

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties at some length, perusal of the facts of the case would show that the petitioner had duly applied in pursuance to the advertisement dated 16.04.2018 (Annexure P-1) however, the candidature of the petitioner was rejected on the ground that she had erased/smudged an answer to the question which was in violation of the prescribed instructions. It transpires that as per the instructions issued by the respondent-Commission, in a case, if a candidate erases or smudges an answer on the OMR sheet, the answer sheet stands cancelled. It is not in dispute that the petitioner had erased/smudged the answer to Question No.72 on the OMR sheet. Taking into consideration the relevant instructions, the answer sheet of the petitioner could not be evaluated and was accordingly cancelled.

6. In light of the above said facts, as the petitioner has erased/smudged the answer to question No.72 on the OMR sheet being in violation of the instructions, the answer sheet of the petitioner in terms of the instructions has rightly not been evaluated and was cancelled.

7. In view of above, this Court finds no merit in the writ petition and accordingly, the same is dismissed.

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

(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)
JUDGE

05.05.2026

Rimpal

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No