

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

254 (9 cases)

CWP-13867-2017
Date of Decision: 12.02.2026

Balram

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

With

Sr. No.	Case No.	Petitioner(s)	Respondents
2.	CWP-12736-2017 (O&M)	Virpal Dalal and others	State of Haryana and others
3.	CWP-13552-2017 (O&M)	Pardeep Kumar	State of Haryana and another
4.	CWP-13658-2017	Rohit	State of Haryana and others
5.	CWP-13728-2017	Satish	State of Haryana and others
6.	CWP-13766-2017	Jagbir Singh and another	State of Haryana and another
7.	CWP-13770-2017	Rajat Kumar	State of Haryana and another
8.	CWP-13844-2017	Pardeep	State of Haryana and others
9.	CWP-13892-2017 (O&M)	Mahipal and others	State of Haryana and others

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Gaurav Tyagi, Advocate for
Mr. S.S. Kharb, Advocate the petitioners
(in CWP No.12736 of 2017, CWP No.13552 of 2017 &
CWP No.13766 of 2017)

Mr. Vikas Malik, Advocate for
Mr. Balbir Kumar Saini, Advocate for petitioner
(in CWP No.13867 of 2017)

Mr. Harinder Malik, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CWP No.13728 of 2017)

Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubbar,
Additional Advocate General, Haryana

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J.** (Oral)

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned petitions, with the consent of both sides, the same are hereby disposed of by this common order.

CWP-13867-2017

2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of result dated 22.05.2017 declared for calling the candidates for Interview-cum-Personality Test. He is further seeking direction to respondents to conduct his interview.

3. The petitioner, pursuant to Advertisement No.8/2015 dated 19.07.2015, applied for the post of Constable under BC-B Category. As per advertisement, the selection process comprised four stages i.e. Physical Screening Test ('PST'), Knowledge Test ('KT'), Physical Measurement Test ('PMT') and Interview-cum-Personality Test. PST carried 15 marks, KT 60 marks and PMT 15 marks. There were total 5,000 posts which were divided into different categories. 1650 seats were earmarked for General Category, 1000 for SC Category, 800 for BC-A, 550 for BC-B, 500 for SBC and 500 for EBP GC. All the candidates were supposed to participate in PST Screening Test which was to be followed by Knowledge Test. The candidates were supposed to qualify standards prescribed under Rule 12.15(2) read with 12.16(9)(C) of Punjab Police Rules, 1934 (as applicable to State of Haryana) (for short 'PPR'). On the basis of combined score of PST+KT+PMT, the candidates had to be invited for Interview-cum-Personality Test. Three times of number of vacancies in each category had to be invited for Interview-cum-Personality Test. The respondent conducted PST of 5,05,566 candidates. 1,25,677 candidates qualified in the PST. In the

Knowledge Test, 19,174 candidates qualified. 13,179 candidates qualified



for PMT. Three times of vacancies in each category were selected for interview. Cut-off of last candidate called for Interview-cum-Personality Test in each category was as below:

Sr. No.	Category	Cut-off marks
1.	General Category	54.90
2.	SC Category	45.00
3.	BC-A Category	48.90
4.	BC-B Category	54.95
5.	EBPGC	31.40

4. The respondent called candidates for interview as detailed below:

Sr. No.	Category	Number of Posts	Number of Candidates called for Interview
1.	General Category	1650	4968
2.	SC Category	1000	3011
3.	BC-A Category	800	2400
4.	BC-B Category	550	1657
5.	EBPGC	500	1143

5. It is apt to mention here that no reservation was finally granted to SBC Category candidates. They filed *CWP No.21480 of 2016* before this Court. As per orders of this Court, candidates of SBC Category were considered under General Category. The petitioner participated upto the stage of PMT, however, was not called for interview. In the writ petition, he claimed that last candidate in BC-B Category has scored 54.95 marks while he has obtained more marks. He has qualified PMT. He was not aware of marks secured by him in all the three stages.

**CWP-13867-2017 & connected cases****-4-**

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner, during the course of hearing, pleaded that respondent did not invite candidates three times of advertised posts for interview, thus, selection process was bad in the eye of law.

7. Learned State counsel for the respondent pointed out that there were 550 posts for BC-B and respondent was supposed to invite 1,650 candidates for interview whereas 1,657 candidates were called for interview. The petitioner scored 13 marks in PST, 29.25 in KT and 10 in PMT. His grand total was 52.25 marks whereas last candidate called for interview under BC-B category secured 54.95 marks.

CWP-13552-2017, CWP-12736-2017, CWP-13658-2017, CWP-13844-2017 & CWP-13892-2017

8. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that respondent No.3 to 5 were not in the merit list still were called for interview and thereafter selected. This shows arbitrariness and misuse of power on the part of Recruitment Board.

9. Learned State counsel submits that private respondents belong to SBC category. 500 seats were earmarked for SBC, however, it was decided not to grant reservation under said category. The candidates approached this Court and as per orders of this Court, SBC candidates were permitted to participate under General Category. Result of candidates who applied under SBC category was declared and they were considered under General Category. In the backdrop, the private respondents came to be selected.

CWP-13770-2017 & CWP-13728-2017

10. Learned State counsel submits that petitioners applied under SC Category. They had scored marks less than of last candidate called for

**CWP-13766-2025**

11. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners were wrongly rejected in PST. As per CCTV footage, they have completed event within prescribed period. i.e. 5 Km race in 25 minutes.

12. Learned State counsel submits that RFID Technology was used to ascertain exact time consumed by candidates in race. Multiple cameras were installed at different places. The time shown in different cameras is always different, thus, reliance was placed upon RFID Technology. Any adverse inference would disturb selection of thousands of candidates.

13. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

FINDINGS:**CWP-13766-2017**

14. The petitioners were subjected to PST. The respondent installed CCTV cameras as well as used RFID Technology to ascertain time consumed in 5 Km race. The qualifying time was 25 minutes whereas petitioners consumed much more time, thus, they were disqualified. The respondent has used modern technology. Thousands of candidates participated and no grievance was raised by candidates at large. In the circumstances, it is difficult to disbelieve procedure and technology adopted by respondent.

CWP-13552-2017, CWP-12736-2017, CWP-13658-2017, CWP-13844-2017 & CWP-13892-2017

15. The petitioners are claiming that private respondents were called for interview and thereafter wrongly selected. The private respondents participated in the selection process under SBC category. The respondent decided to withdraw benefit of SBC category and result of candidates who



applied under said category was not declared. They approached this Court and as per orders of this Court, they were considered under General Category. Their result was declared and were found eligible for interview. They cut the ice and were selected. There was no irregularity in their selection. They could not be left high and dry. The State was bound to consider them under General Category in lieu of SBC Category. There was no procedural or substantive irregularity or infirmity on the part of respondents, thus, claim of petitioners cannot be countenanced.

CWP-13867-2017

16. The petitioner participated upto the stage of PMT, however, was not called for interview. In the writ petition, he claimed that last candidate in BC-B Category has scored 54.95 marks while he has obtained more marks. He has qualified PMT. He was not aware of marks secured by him in all the three stages. During the course of hearing, petitioner pleaded that respondent did not invite candidates three times of advertised posts for interview.

17. The grievance of the petitioner is not sustainable in view of the fact that respondent had invited three times candidates for interview in BC-B Category. He scored less than last selected candidate, thus, he was rightly ignored for interview.

CWP-13770-2017 & CWP-13728-2017

18. The petitioners had scored less than last selected candidate, thus, they were rightly rejected at the stage of interview.

19. There is another aspect of the matter. The petitioners were not called for interview which carried marks. The stages upto PST carried 90 marks. the petitioners were not examined for remaining 10 marks.

**CWP-13867-2017 & connected cases****-7-**

A period of more than 10 years from the date of advertisement has passed away and selection process stands completed. At this stage, it would not be appropriate to disturb selection of any candidate or ask the respondent to reconduct race or re-examine outcome of earlier race or consider the petitioner for interview-cum-personality test. It would be appropriate to give quietus to the litigation.

20. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that petitions deserve to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

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

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

12.02.2026
Mohit Kumar

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