



215

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

**CWP-14551-2019(O&M)
Date of decision : 07.04.2026**

Safdar Ali

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH
NALWA**

Present: Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravi Pratap Singh, DAG, Haryana.

DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA, J. (Oral)

In the present writ petition, the petitioner is praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the final result dated 28.02.2019 (Annexure P-5), wherein the name of the petitioner does not figure. It has also been prayed that the benefit of 05 marks be awarded to the petitioner under the Socio Economic Criteria and, thereafter, the case of the petitioner be considered for appointment to the post of Police Male Constable (GD) in the BC-B category, as the petitioner, after addition of the aforesaid 05 marks, would secure more marks than the last selected candidate in the said category.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the respondents issued an advertisement dated 16.04.2018 (Annexure P-1) for recruitment of 5000 posts of Male Constable (GD), out of which 400 posts were reserved for the BC-B category. The petitioner, who belongs to the BC-B category, applied in pursuant to the said advertisement and duly



participated in the selection process. The final result was declared on 28.02.2019 (Annexure P-5), wherein the name of the petitioner did not figure. As the name of the petitioner did not figure in the final result (Annexure P-5), the petitioner approached the Department and came to know that he had not been awarded 05 marks under the Socio Economic Criteria. It is the case of the petitioner that, if 05 marks were awarded under the Socio Economic Criteria to the petitioner as per the advertisement, he would have secured more marks than the last selected candidate in the BC-B category. Aggrieved against the action of the respondent in not awarding 05 marks to the petitioner under the Socio Economic Criteria, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was entitled for grant of 05 marks under the Socio Economic Criteria, as he had furnished a declaration-cum-undertaking dated 15.05.2018 (Annexure P-6) stating that no member of his family was a regular employee in any State Department/Board/Corporation etc.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that there is no dispute that the petitioner applied pursuant to the advertisement (Annexure P-1). However, a perusal of the application form (Annexure P-3) submitted by the petitioner reveals that, in the column pertaining to Socio Economic Criteria, the petitioner had mentioned that a member of his family was in employment. He further submits that, at the time of scrutiny of documents also, petitioner submitted a scrutiny form dated 11.02.2019 (Annexure R-3/1), wherein it was specifically



mentioned that the Socio Economic Criteria was not applicable in his case.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and perused the paper-book along with records.

6. The only issue involved in the present writ petition is whether the petitioner is entitled for grant of 05 marks under the Socio Economic Criteria.

7. The sole contention raised by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner is that in view of the declaration-cum-undertaking dated 15.05.2018 (Annexure P-6) given by the petitioner, the petitioner is entitled for grant of 05 marks under the Socio Economic Criteria. If 05 marks are given, the petitioner would secure more marks than the last selected candidate in BC-B category and would become entitled to be appointed to the post of Male Constable (GD). In regard to the above contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is concerned, a perusal of the facts of the case would show that there is no dispute that the petitioner had given a declaration-cum-undertaking dated 15.05.2018 (Annexure P-6) after the process of selection had started, wherein he has stated that no member of the family of the petitioner was a regular employee in any Department of the Government/Board/Corporation etc. Further, there is also no dispute that in the application form (Annexure P-3) filled by the petitioner, the petitioner had himself mentioned under the head of Socio Economic Criteria that a member of his family was in employment on regular basis. A perusal of the scrutiny form dated 11.02.2019 (Annexure R-



3/1) submitted at the time of scrutiny of documents would show that the petitioner has also mentioned therein that Socio Economic Criteria would not be applicable in the case of petitioner.

8. Taking into consideration the abovesaid facts, it would be apt to conclude that even after furnishing the declaration-cum-undertaking dated 15.05.2018 (Annexure P-6), the petitioner submitted a scrutiny form dated 11.02.2019 (Annexure R-3/1) at the time of scrutiny of documents wherein he has explicitly mentioned that the Socio Economic Criteria was not applicable to him. Taking into consideration the detail mentioned in scrutiny form dated 11.02.2019 (Annexure R-3/1) submitted by the petitioner, the petitioner has rightly not been given 05 marks under the Socio Economic Criteria.

9. In view of above, this Court finds not merit in the present writ petition, as such, the same is dismissed.

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

07.04.2026	(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)	
<i>d.gulati</i>	JUDGE	
Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No