



CWP-16130-2021

:1:

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CWP-16130-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision : 04.02.2026

MANPREET KAUR

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA

Present :- Mr. Nitin Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Ahuja, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Anupam Singla, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

Mr. Ranjit Singh Kalra, Advocate with
Ms. Mona Yadav, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

Deepinder Singh Nalwa, J. (Oral)

1. In the present writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the Selection List dated 14.08.2021 (Annexure P-4) qua respondent No.5, whereby he has been selected in pursuant to the advertisement dated 09.10.2020 (Annexure P-1).

2. Brief facts of the case are that respondent No.2 issued an advertisement dated 09.10.2020 (Annexure P-1) whereby 13 posts of D.P.E. (male and female) were advertised. As per the advertisement, 8 posts were reserved for D.P.E. (male) and 5 posts were reserved for D.P.E (female). Out

**CWP-16130-2021****:2:**

of 8 posts reserved for D.P.E. (male), 03 posts were reserved for General, 01 post for Gen ESM, 02 posts for SC (R&O), 01 post for SC (M&B) and 01 post of BC. In regard to 05 posts reserved for D.P.E. (female), 01 post was reserved for Gen ESM, 02 posts for SC (R&O), 01 post for SC (M&B), and 01 post was reserved for BC.

3. In pursuance to the above-said advertisement dated 09.10.2020 (Annexure P-1), the petitioner applied for consideration for appointment on the post of D.P.E (female) in SC (R&O) category. The respondents issued a corrigendum dated 23.11.2020 (Annexure R-1), wherein it was mentioned that in terms of letter dated 20.11.2020 of Meritorious Society office, thirteen posts advertised of D.P.E. (Master) in pursuance to the advertisement dated 09.10.2020 (Annexure P-1) were to be filled on the basis of common merit amongst male and female candidates and rest of the terms and conditions were to remain the same.

4. The petitioner appeared in the written test held on 11.04.2021 conducted by respondent No.2. The merit list was published by the respondents. As per the merit list, the petitioner was placed at serial No.160 and had secured 73 marks. Thereafter, candidates were called for scrutiny of documents and ultimately, the select list dated 14.08.2021 was uploaded on the website of the respondents. A copy of the same is Annexure P-4. As per select list dated 14.08.2021 (Annexure P-4), the name of the petitioner did not figure in the list, whereas the name of respondent No.5 was shown at serial No.4 of the SC (R&O) category. A perusal of the same would show that respondent No.5 has secured 77 marks.

**CWP-16130-2021****:3:**

5. Aggrieved against the action of the respondents in not showing the name of the petitioner in the list of selected candidates, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that in terms of the advertisement dated 09.10.2020 (Annexure P-1), since there were separate posts for female and male candidates and the petitioner had secured 73 marks, she was entitled to be considered against the post reserved for D.P.E (female) in SC (R&O) category. It is further submitted that respondent No.5, being a male candidate, could not have been considered against the post reserved for female candidates. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that a perusal of the corrigendum dated 23.11.2020 (Annexure R-1) would show that while issuing the corrigendum, the respondents relied upon the notification dated 21.10.2020 and letter dated 20.11.2020, which were issued after the advertisement (Annexure P-1), and therefore, the above said notification and letter could not have been taken into consideration while issuing the corrigendum.

7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that after issuance of the advertisement dated 09.10.2020 (Annexure P-1), a corrigendum dated 23.11.2020 (Annexure R-1) was issued wherein it was mentioned that the 13 posts of D.P.E. (Master) were to be filled on the basis of common merit list amongst male and female candidates. Since respondent No.5 had secured higher marks than the petitioner, he was rightly selected for appointment.

8. After hearing learned counsel for the parties at some length, a perusal of the facts of the case would show that vide advertisement

**CWP-16130-2021****:4:**

(Annexure P-1), 08 posts were reserved for D.P.E. (male) and 05 posts were reserved for D.P.E. (female), the respondents subsequently issued a corrigendum dated 23.11.2020 (Annexure R-1) wherein, it was mentioned that the 13 posts advertised in pursuance to the advertisement dated 09.10.2020 (Annexure P-1) were to be filled on the basis of a common merit list amongst male and female candidates. In other words, all 13 posts were to be filled from amongst male and female candidates on the basis of merit.

9. The petitioner has not challenged the corrigendum dated 23.11.2020 (Annexure R-1) and, in fact, the petitioner duly participated in the selection process conducted after the issuance of corrigendum and appointments have been made in pursuance to the corrigendum dated 23.11.2020 (Annexure R-1), as such, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.

10. Accordingly the writ petition is devoid of merit and is dismissed.

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

(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)
JUDGE

04.02.2026

Rimpal

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No