



218

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

CWP-24854-2025

Date of decision: 10.04.2026

SWATI

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

..RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Arya, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Ms. Harpriya Khaneka, Advocate and
Ms. Richa Tayal, Advocate
for respondent No.3/HPSC.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a direction to the respondents to re-check the petitioner's answer sheet of the Subject Knowledge Test for the post of Assistant Professor (Fine Arts), against advertisement 50/2024.

2. Learned counsel for the Commission contended that as per the announcement dated 11.11.2025, the interested candidates were asked to deposit fee for inspecting their answer sheet. In response thereto, the petitioner, bearing roll No.1476, applied for inspection by depositing the requisite fee, and was allowed to inspect the answer sheet of Subject Knowledge Test for the post of Assistant Professor (Fine Arts) on 11.12.2025, as per schedule notified on 01.12.2025. Accordingly, her grievance stands redressed.

**CWP-24854-2025****-2-**

3. Without disputing the facts aforementioned, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the prayer for re-checking the answer sheet has not been granted by the Commission. The petitioner has been a topper throughout her career and it appears her answer sheet has not been correctly evaluated, or else she would not have remained unsuccessful. Therefore, it should be allowed to be evaluated by an independent expert.

4. Heard.

5. It is apparent on record that there is no provision in the advertisement which provides for re-checking of the answer sheet. The only provision is to permit the candidates to inspect their answer sheets, which has already been permitted on 11.12.2025. Merely because the petitioner thinks that being meritorious she could not have fared badly in the exam, it cannot be a ground for this Court to issue directions to re-evaluate/re-check her answer sheet. In the absence of any provision, she has no vested right to seek such a direction. Besides, there is no allegation of *mala fide* or arbitrariness on the part of the Commission or the examiner.

6. Accordingly, finding no ground to interfere, the petition stands dismissed.

April 10, 2026
poonam

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE