



218

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

**CWP-29277-2024(O&M)
Date of decision : 17.02.2026**

Ravi Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

Punjab Agriculture University, Ludhiana and others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Hardeep Singh, Advocate (through VC) for the
petitioner.
Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate for respondents No.1 to 4.

Mr. Nirmal Preet Singh Hira, DAG, Punjab for
respondents No.5 and 6.

DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA, J. (Oral)

In the present writ petition, the petitioner is praying for
issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents
No.1 to 3 to declare the result for the posts of Computer Operator as
advertised in pursuance of the advertisement No.03/2020 (Annexure P-
3). It has also been prayed for further direction to respondents No.5 and
6-State to fix the pay-scale for the posts of Computer Operator to be
appointed in Punjab Agriculture University (hereinafter to be referred
as 'University') as per the recommendations of the Seventh Pay
Commission.

2. The brief facts of the case are that respondent No.1-
University issued an advertisement in the year 2020 (Annexure P-3)



advertising various posts. One of the post advertised was of the post of Computer Operator. In pursuance of the abovesaid advertisement (Annexure P-3), the petitioner applied for appointment to the post of Computer Operator. The written test was held on 14.10.2021 and thereafter, the result was declared by the respondent-University. The respondent-University called the candidates for verification of the documents for consideration for appointment to the post of Computer Operator. The petitioner duly appeared before the scrutiny committee with documents for the purpose of scrutiny. The respondent-University did not declare the final result of the post of Computer Operator. As a consequence of this, the petitioner approached the respondent-University for declaration of the result of the said post.

3. It transpires that as the pay-scale of the post of Computer Operator was not fixed by the State, as such, the post of Computer Operator could not be filled. Aggrieved against the action of the respondent-University in not making appointment on the post of Computer Operator, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a direction be issued to the State to fix the pay-scale for the posts of Computer Operator so that the appointments can be made on the abovesaid post. It is also the case of learned counsel for the petitioner that the respondent-University be directed to declare the result of post of Computer Operator as advertised in pursuance of advertisement (Annexure P-3).



5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent-University submits that the result for the post of Computer Operator was duly declared by the respondent-University in regard to one post advertised and as per the result, the petitioner is at Sr. No.8 in the merit list. There are seven candidates who are higher in merit than the petitioner. He further submits that the appointments could not be made on the post of Computer Operator as on account of revision of pay-scale by the State, there is no corresponding pay-scale fixed for the post of Computer Operator, as such, no appointment was made on the post of Computer Operator. It is also the case of learned counsel for the respondent-University that even otherwise also, even if the appointment is made, the petitioner would not be entitled for appointment as there are seven other candidates who have scored higher than the petitioner and have better claim for appointment than the petitioner.

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

7. A perusal of the facts of the present case would show that no appointment has been made by the respondent-University on the ground that there is no corresponding pay-scale fixed by the State in respect to the post of Computer Operator on account of revision of pay-scales. A perusal of the facts of the case would further show that as per the respondent-University, only one post was advertised and there are 07 candidates who are higher in merit than the petitioner. It is well settled law that mere selection does not confer any right on the



candidate to claim appointment. A candidate who is lower in merit does not have a vested right to claim appointment just because selection process was conducted and concluded. There is a justifiable reason for not making appointment on the post of Computer Operator as on revision of the pay-scale, there is no corresponding pay-scale fixed by the State in respect to the post of Computer Operator, as such, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.

8. In view of above, this Court find no merit in the present writ petition.
9. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed.
10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand(s) disposed of.

17.02.2026

d.gulati

(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)

JUDGE

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