

CWP-19266-2020

2026:PHHC:089295



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

222

CWP-19266-2020

Date of Decision: **02.07.2026**

Mani Ram

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. S.K. Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG Haryana-State.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India with a prayer for issuance of an appropriate writ or order in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing final result/order dated 20.12.2018 (Annexure P-5) to the extent vide which result of petitioner has been withheld illegally despite the fact that petitioner is duly eligible and qualified for the post of TGT Punjabi as per advertisement as well as per Haryana School Education (Group-C) State Cadre Service Rules, 2012. Further praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing respondents to declare the result of petitioner and to give appointment on the post of TGT Punjabi with all consequential benefits.

CWP-19266-2020

2026:PHHC:089295



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner is primarily aggrieved by the action of the respondent-Commission in withholding his result. It is submitted that the petitioner had applied for the post of TGT Punjabi pursuant to Advertisement No.4/2016 (Annexure P-2) under the SC category and was issued Roll No.1401000763. The respondent-Commission conducted the written examination on 24.07.2016 and, upon declaration of the result of the written examination, the petitioner was called for scrutiny of documents. The petitioner duly participated in the scrutiny of documents and was thereafter called for interview held on 29.10.2018. However, while declaring the final result dated 20.12.2018 (Annexure P-5), the result of the petitioner was kept in a sealed cover, compelling him to invoke the writ jurisdiction of this Court.

3. *Per contra*, learned State Counsel, at the very outset, has referred to paragraph 8 of the short reply as well as Annexure R-3/4 (letter dated 10.03.2021) and submits that during the pendency of the present writ petition, the result of the petitioner has already been declared. It is contended that the petitioner secured a total of 100 marks out of 200 marks, i.e. 90 marks in the written examination and 10 marks in the interview. However, the petitioner could not be selected as he secured lesser marks than the prescribed cut-off under the SC category, the last selected candidate having secured 106 marks. Learned counsel, therefore, prays for dismissal of the present writ petition.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the paper book as well as the pleadings with their able assistance.

CWP-19266-2020

2026:PHHC:089295



5. A perusal of paragraph 8 of the short reply filed on behalf of respondent No.3 reads as under:-

*"That the main prayer of the petitioner in the present writ petition is to declare the final result of petitioner and to give appointment to the petitioner on the post of TGT Punjabi. In this regard it is submitted that the Commission has declared the result of the petitioner vide Memo No.1031/HSSC/CA-2/2021/103 dated 10.03.2021 and the same has been duly conveyed to the petitioner through registered post. It is further submitted that **the petitioner has secured total 100 marks (Written marks 90 and Interview 10 marks) out of total 200 marks** for the post in question and petitioner is not selected due to lesser marks in his respective category i.e. under SC category. The cut-off marks in **SC category for the post in question is 106 marks.**"*

6. The aforesaid stand of the respondent-Commission is duly supported by Annexure R-3/4, whereby the petitioner has been informed that he secured an aggregate of 100 marks out of 200 marks and that the last selected candidate in the SC category secured 106 marks.

7. In view of the above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the grievance raised in the present writ petition regarding withholding of the petitioner's result no longer survives, inasmuch as the respondent-Commission has already declared the result of the petitioner during the pendency of the writ petition. Once the petitioner has been considered on merits and has secured only 100 marks as against the cut-off of 106 marks under the SC category, he cannot claim appointment as a matter of right.

CWP-19266-2020

2026:PHHC:089295



Besides, the petitioner has neither challenged the selection of any selected candidate nor assailed the cut-off marks or the selection process. In the absence of any such challenge, no enforceable legal right survives in favour of the petitioner warranting interference by this Court in exercise of its extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

8. Consequently, finding no merit in the present writ petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

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

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

02.07.2026

Puneet Chawla

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No

Whether Reportable. : Yes/No