



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

140

CWP-19402-2026

Date of Decision: 25.06.2026

HIMANSHU YADAV

.....Petitioner

VERSUS**STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. Abhishek Mashri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Malhotra, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate
for the respondents No.2 and 3-HPSC.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India with a prayer for issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing the schedule dated 12.06.2026 issued by the respondent-Commission for conducting the Main Examination for HCS (Executive Branch) and other Allied Services from 27.06.2026 to 29.06.2026.

2026:PHHC:088147



1.1. Further, a prayer has been made for issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to postpone the aforesaid Main Examination till the finalization of the valid revised result, as directed by this Court in CWP-16447-2026 titled ***Ashwani Kumar versus State of Haryana and others***, decided on 11.06.2026, and to provide sufficient and equitable time to the petitioner and other similarly situated candidates for preparation.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner, being eligible under the BC (B) (Non-Creamy Layer) category, applied pursuant to Advertisement No. 22/2026 issued by the respondent-Commission and appeared in the Preliminary Examination held on 26.04.2026. It is submitted that although the petitioner had secured the prescribed qualifying marks, he was initially excluded from the result on account of errors in the answer key and the improper preparation of the merit list by the respondent-Commission. Learned counsel submits that after judicial intervention and revision of the result on multiple occasions, the petitioner was finally declared qualified in the fourth revised result dated 01.06.2026 and became eligible to appear in the Main Examination.

2.1. It is further contended that despite the petitioner being declared successful only on 01.06.2026, the respondent-Commission scheduled the Main Examination from 27.06.2026 to 29.06.2026, thereby leaving the petitioner with barely three weeks to prepare, whereas the candidates who



had been declared successful in the earlier results had substantially more time for preparation. Such action, it is argued, has resulted in hostile discrimination and denial of a level playing field, thereby violating the petitioner's fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

2.2. Learned counsel further submits that this Court, in ***CWP-16447-2026*** titled ***Ashwani Kumar versus State of Haryana and other***, vide judgment dated 11.06.2026, directed the respondent-Commission to revise the result strictly in accordance with Advertisement No. 22/2026. However, in disregard of the said directions, the respondent-Commission proceeded to notify the schedule of the Main Examination without first revising the result in terms of the judgment and while challenges relating to the selection process were still pending consideration before this Court.

2.3. It is thus contended that the petitioner cannot be made to suffer on account of the repeated administrative lapses and errors committed by the respondent-Commission. The impugned action is stated to be arbitrary, unfair and violative of the principles of natural justice, fairness and equal opportunity in public employment, as it deprives the petitioner of a reasonable and effective opportunity to compete with other candidates on equal terms, thereby causing grave prejudice to his career and infringing his fundamental rights under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India and as such, the schedule of the Main Examination is required to be stayed and

2026:PHHC:088147



deferred to enable the petitioner to properly prepare for the Main Examination.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent-Commission submits that the petition filed by the petitioner at the eleventh hour is wholly misconceived. He submits that a public notice dated 19.01.2026 had been issued well in advance, informing all prospective candidates to remain prepared for the forthcoming Main Examination. He has also placed on record a copy of the said public notice dated 19.01.2026, which is taken on record as Mark 'X'. He further submits that the subsequent notice dated 12.06.2026 (Annexure P-12) was issued in continuation of the earlier notice dated 19.01.2026. It is further submitted that as many as 1,283 candidates are participating in the selection process scheduled to be held from 27.06.2026 to 29.06.2026 and, therefore, at the *ipse dixit* of a single candidate, the entire selection process cannot be stalled at the eleventh hour. He further contends that candidates ordinarily prepare for competitive examinations well in advance and that neither any prejudice nor any *mala fides* have been attributed to the respondent-Commission. It is submitted that all similarly situated candidates have accepted the schedule and no grievance has been raised by any other candidate.

4. In rebuttal, learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the judgments of the Delhi High Court in ***Sumit Kumar vs. High Court of Delhi and Another, W.P.(C) No. 3453 of 2016; Ankur Jain***



vs. High Court of Delhi and Another, W.P.(C) No. 515 of 2012; and *Gunjan Sinha Jain vs. Registrar General, High Court of Delhi, W.P.(C) No. 449 of 2012*. Referring to paragraph 24 of *Sumit Kumar (supra)*, he submits that the Division Bench categorically held that candidates who were subsequently declared eligible were required to be granted adequate time for preparation and accordingly directed rescheduling of the Main Examination. He further relies upon paragraph 81 of *Gunjan Sinha Jain (supra)*, wherein similar directions were issued for refixation of the examination schedule so as to afford sufficient preparation time to newly declared eligible candidates. It is thus contended that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the aforesaid judgments. Learned counsel has also relied upon the judgment of this Court in *Jitender Kumar and Another vs. Haryana Public Service Commission, CWP-10309-2012*, decided on 30.08.2012, wherein this Court intervened even two days prior to the scheduled Main Examination and directed rescheduling thereof.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record with their able assistance, it transpires that the respondent-Commission has acted with due diligence. A public announcement dated 19.01.2026 (Mark 'X') had been issued well in advance notifying the prospective candidates of the schedule of the Main Examination, thereby affording adequate notice and sufficient time for preparation. The subsequent notification dated 12.06.2026 (Annexure P-12)

2026:PHHC:088147



was merely issued in continuation of the earlier announcement dated 19.01.2026 and did not introduce any fresh or abrupt schedule. Consequently, it cannot be said that the examination schedule was notified suddenly or without adequate notice.

6. It is further evident that the revised result came to be published pursuant to judicial intervention, and no fault can be attributed to the respondent-Commission on that account. Moreover, the Main Examination is to be undertaken by 1,283 candidates, and the entire selection process, involving a large number of candidates, cannot be interdicted merely at the instance of a single candidate, particularly at the verge of commencement of the examination. The judgments relied upon by the petitioner are clearly distinguishable on facts, as the revised result in the present case was declared pursuant to the judgment rendered by the learned Single Judge of this Court in *Hardeep Singh vs. State of Haryana through its Chief Secretary, Government of Haryana, CWP-15839-2026*, decided on 27.05.2026, and the factual matrix therein is materially different from that of the present case.

7. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court finds no illegality, arbitrariness, mala fides or procedural irregularity in the impugned notification dated 12.06.2026 warranting interference in the exercise of extraordinary writ jurisdiction under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India. The petitioner has failed to make out a case for grant of any of the

2026:PHHC:088147



reliefs prayed for. Furthermore, the balance of convenience also does not lie in favour of postponing an ongoing public recruitment process involving a large number of candidates merely on the basis of the grievance raised by an individual candidate. Accordingly, the present writ petition, is hereby dismissed.

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

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

25.06.2026
parul verma

Whether speaking/reasoned. :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable. :	Yes/No