



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

Sr. No.212**CWP-18287-2017****Date of Decision: 22.04.2026**

Kiran Wati

.... Petitioner

Versus

Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and
Technology, Hisar and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Dhiraj Chawla, Advocate, and
Mr. Mehak Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Puneet Gupta, Advocate, and
Mr. Ravindra Singh, Advocate,
for respondents no.1 to 3-University.

Mr. Balraj Gujjar, Advocate,
Mr. Naveen, Advocate, and
Mr. Vikas Saroha, Advocate, for respondent no.4.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the final result and awards by selection committee of the University for the post of Steno-Typist pursuant to advertisement 1/2014, Annexure P-1. The University advertised ten posts of Steno-Typist, out of which one was reserved for BCB category, to which the petitioner belonged. She participated in the selection process securing 51.5 marks in shorthand test, and was awarded 12.46 marks for academic qualifications. In total, she got 63.96 marks as against the fourth respondent, who secured 46.5 marks in shorthand test and was awarded 10.84 marks for academic qualifications, making her total marks 57.34.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the position was reversed after the interview wherein the petitioner was awarded only

three marks out of twelve, and the fourth respondent was awarded ten marks



with a view to enabling her reach the merit position number one. On that basis, she was offered the appointment. He further contends that the criteria for selection laid down in the advertisement prescribing twenty-eight marks for academic qualifications, sixty marks for shorthand test and twelve marks for interview, is arbitrary inasmuch as the marks for interview have not been sub-divided. It has vitiated the selection made on that basis.

3. Learned counsel for the University contends that *firstly* the petition is not maintainable as the petitioner was well aware of the criteria which was incorporated in the advertisement. However, without objecting to the same she participated in the selection process, and only after remaining unsuccessful approached this Court by filing the instant petition. *Secondly*, no rule or regulation has been violated by the University in prescribing twelve marks for interview. *Thirdly*, there is no allegation of any *mala fide* against the University or members of the selection committee.

4. Submissions made by learned counsel for the parties have been considered.

5. Apparently, the petitioner participated in the selection process without objecting to the criteria prescribing twelve marks for interview, which was notified in the advertisement itself. Accordingly, she cannot be permitted to turn around and challenge the same after remaining unsuccessful in the selection process. Besides, prescribing twelve marks out of hundred for interview cannot be termed arbitrary in any manner. The Courts have consistently held that prescribing about ten to fifteen per cent marks for interview is reasonable. Further, there is no justification to sub-divide the marks for interview in a case like the instant one, where the selection has been made based upon a criteria of hundred marks divided into three parts, stipulating twenty-eight marks for academic qualifications, sixty marks for shorthand test, and the remaining twelve marks for interview.



Further sub-division of marks of interview is not justifiable as the same are not large enough to leave room for maneuvering the entire selection result on that basis. Sub-division of marks may have justification in a case where the selection is based solely on the marks of interview, which is not the case. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to cite any rule, regulation, instruction or precedent to substantiate the argument either. Additionally, award of marks by the selection committee to the petitioner, who got three out of twelve marks in the interview, as against ten marks to the fourth respondent, cannot in itself be termed an arbitrary assessment. There is nothing to conclude that these marks are not commensurate to the performance of these two candidates before the committee. Only because the fourth respondent was selected over the petitioner on the basis of her marks of interview, that is not a factor in itself to term the entire exercise biased against the latter. It can also not be lost sight of that no allegation of *mala fide* or bias has been levelled against any member of the selection committee.

6. In view of the discussion, there is no merit in the petition, and it stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

22.04.2026
Maninder

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