



224

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

**CWP-23654-2023(O&M)
Date of decision : 14.01.2026**

Sukh Harman Preet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH
NALWA**

Present: Mr. S.S. Panag, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Cyrus, Advocate for
Mr. M.K. Dogra, Advocate for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Sarthak Gupta, Advocate for respondent No.4.

Mr. Barjesh K. Sharma, Advocate and
Ms. Shiwani, Advocate for respondent No.5.

DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA, J. (Oral)

In the present writ petition, the petitioner is praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the result dated 03.10.2023 (Annexure P-6) and also any appointment letter issued in pursuance of Annexure P-6.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the respondent-University invited online applications for various Teaching and Non-Teaching posts in the University (Annexure P-1). The petitioner fulfilling the conditions mentioned in the advertisement applied for consideration for appointment on the post of Junior Engineer (Civil).



There were two posts of Junior Engineer (Civil) advertised in the abovementioned advertisement. The written examination for the purpose of selection was held on 21.05.2022. The petitioner duly appeared in the written examination and qualified the same. The result of the written examination was declared by the University. After the declaration of written examination (Annexure P-4), practical test was also conducted for the qualified candidates. The petitioner duly participated in the practical test conducted by the University. Upon completion of the practical test, final result was declared by the University on 03.10.2023 (Annexure P-6). In the final result dated 03.10.2023 (Annexure P-6), name of the petitioner figures at Sr. No.3 in the merit list; whereas name of respondent No.5 figures at Sr. No.1 and the name of respondent No.4 figures at Sr. No.2. Aggrieved against the abovesaid result dated 03.10.2023 (Annexure P-6) declared by the respondent-University, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition challenging the same.

3. The contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is that respondent No.4 has been awarded higher marks in practical test to facilitate his appointment as the Chairman of the Selection Committee was working in Civil Engineering Department in the University as an Assistant Professor along with respondent No.4. Learned counsel further submits that fixing 30 marks for practical test is excessive.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent-University submits that there is no evidence or material led by the petitioner to show that



respondent No.4 was awarded higher marks in practical test to facilitate appointment to respondent No.4. It is also the contention raised by learned counsel for the respondent-University that 30 marks fixed for the practical cannot be held to be excessive.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and perused the paper-book along with records.

6. In regard to the contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner that respondent No.4 was awarded higher marks in practical test by the Chairman of the Selection Committee as Chairman was from the same department in which respondent No.4 was working is concerned, no material or any evidence has been led by the petitioner to show that respondent No.4 was awarded higher marks in practical test by respondent No.3 for the purpose of giving appointment. Bald allegations without evidence or material are liable to be rejected. In regard to contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner that 30 marks fixed by the University for practical test is excessive is concerned, it is submitted that abovesaid contention of learned counsel for the petitioner cannot be accepted for the reason that the practical marks which were fixed by the University were based on the experiments conducted by the candidates in the practical test. Taking into consideration the post i.e. J.E. (Civil) and nature of duties attached to the post, it cannot be held that 30 marks fixed by the University for the practical test is excessive.

7. In view of the above, this Court finds no merit in the present writ petition, thus, the same is dismissed.



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

14.01.2026

(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)

d.gulati

JUDGE

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