



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

118

CWP-12295-2026

Date of decision: 23.04.2026

Amber Bhullar

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Transmission Corporation Limited and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. H.C. Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shreya B. Sarin, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the issuance of a writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to relax the minimum qualifying marks in the Computer Based Test conducted in connection with recruitment to the post of Assistant Engineer (OT) Electrical, in pursuance to Advertisement CRA No.12/2025. The petitioner further prays for restraining the respondents from shifting the seven vacant posts of Ex-servicemen (Self/Dependent) women category to any other category during the pendency of the instant petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has, *inter alia*, contended that the respondent/Department issued Advertisement CRA No.12/2025 for the recruitment of Assistant Engineers (OT) Electrical, wherein seven posts were specifically reserved for the Ex-servicemen



(Self/Dependent) women category. The petitioner belongs to the Ex-servicemen (Dependent) women category and applied for the said post. It is contended that the petitioner obtained 38.250 marks in the Online Computer Based Test (CBT), which were the highest marks obtained by any candidate in her category, yet she was not considered qualified as the minimum qualifying marks prescribed for reserved categories was 40. Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that since none of the candidates in this category achieved the qualifying marks, all seven posts have remained vacant. Feeling aggrieved, the petitioner filed a detailed representation dated 15.03.2026 (Annexure P-6) before respondent No.2, which remain undecided. He further submits that in case the relaxation in the marks is not given, it will defeat the very object for which the reservation was given to Ex-Servicemen. Reference has also been made to an earlier precedent of the erstwhile Punjab State Electricity Board (Annexure P-7), where qualifying marks were relaxed to fill the vacant posts. Reliance is further placed on the recent judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **SLP(C) No.11430 of 2026**, titled as ***Diksha Kalson vs State of Haryana and others***, decided on **20.03.2026**, regarding sympathetic consideration for relaxation of marks in service recruitment.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondents, appearing on advance notice, opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the criteria for selection, including the minimum qualifying marks of 40% for reserved categories, were



clearly stipulated in the advertisement CRA No.12/2025. She has further contended that once the selection process has commenced and the candidates have participated with full knowledge of the qualifying criteria, the same cannot be altered or relaxed at the behest of an individual candidate who failed to meet the threshold. It is further argued that the petitioner has no vested right to seek a relaxation and the mere fact that seats remain vacant does not mandate the respondents to lower the standards of recruitment for technical posts like Assistant Engineer.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusal of the record, it is evident that the recruitment, in question was conducted in terms of Advertisement CRA No. 12/2025, which clearly prescribed minimum qualifying marks of 40% for reserved categories, including the Ex-servicemen (Dependent) women category. The petitioner admittedly secured 38.250 marks, which is below the prescribed cut-off. The plea for relaxation of qualifying marks on the ground that posts have remained unfilled cannot be accepted, as eligibility criteria and cut-off marks, once notified, form an integral part of the selection process and cannot be altered or relaxed after its commencement, particularly in the absence of any provision permitting such relaxation. Further, the reliance of the petitioner on the judgment in ***Diksha Kalson's case (supra)*** is totally misplaced, wherein no relaxation had been granted and the respondent was only directed to consider the representation sympathetically.



5. Accordingly, finding no merit in the instant writ petition,
the same is hereby dismissed.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

23.04.2026
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No