

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

289

Date of decision: April 08, 2026

- (1)

CWP-28611-2025

AARTI AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

...Respondents
- (2)

CWP-28456-2025

SHALINI

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Petitioner

...Respondents
- (3)

CWP-29166-2025

SHALU AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

...Respondents
- (4)

CWP-29363-2025

SAMIKSHA AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

...Respondents
- (5)

CWP-30752-2025

PRIYANKA AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

...Respondents
- (6)

CWP-35111-2025

GITIKA

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Petitioner

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Ravinder Singh Dhull, Advocate
Mr. Navnit Sharma, Advocate,
Mr. Suryaveer Surjewala, Advocate (through video conferencing)
Mr. Padam Nath, Advocate,
Mr. Mandeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
Mr. Ajay Singh, Advocate and
Ms. Megha Chadha, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rohit Arya, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate with
Ms. Sheena Dahiya, Advocate
for the respondent-HPSC.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

These petitions are being decided together as common questions arise for consideration on similar facts. All the petitioners are applicants for the post of Assistant Professor (Physics) against advertisement 61/2024. They have approached this Court with the following grievances:

- (I) There were printing errors in the question paper of Subject Knowledge Test that was given to them in the examination centre. Specific reference was made to questions no.4(a), 6, 10, 14, 15(a) and 15(b), in this regard.
- (II) Questions no.1(a), 2(b) and 6 were wrongly framed and were not solvable.

2. On the last date of hearing, learned counsel for the Commission submitted that the questions required to be answered by the candidates were duly printed on the answer sheets also, requiring them to answer only on the

particular page/space where the questions had been printed. Therefore, there was no scope for any confusion due to the said printing errors in the question paper. Some of the answer sheets given to the candidates in the examination centre were also produced before this Court. The assertion was found to be correct and, accordingly, challenge to Subject Knowledge Test result on the basis of printing error was declined vide order passed to that effect on 06.03.2026, which reads as under:

Pursuance to the last order, learned counsel for the Commission has produced five answer sheets given to the candidates, perusal whereof shows that all the questions were printed on the answer sheets as well, requiring the candidates to answer the same in the space/pages provided for the same. It is also clear that the questions which have been objected to by the petitioners were correctly printed on the answer sheets. Accordingly, the challenge to the Subject Knowledge Test result on the basis of printing errors is not sustainable.

2. The answer sheets and sample question papers have been re-sealed and returned to counsel for the Commission.

3. In these circumstances, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contended that three of the questions, bearing no.1(a), 2(b) and 6, are wrong and could not have been answered by the candidates.

4. Learned counsel for the Commission submits that all the objections raised by the candidates were given to the subject experts and the result was finalised in terms of the advice tendered. He seeks an adjournment to produce subject expert's report.

3. With regard to the second prayer, learned counsel for the Commission has produced copies of reports of two subject experts, who are working as Professors in a State institution of higher learning, dated 05.09.2025 and 20.09.2025. A perusal whereof shows that objections to all three questions – 1(a), 2(b) and 6, along with other objections, were examined by these experts. In their opinion, the three questions were solvable and had no typing/printing errors. The experts' reports have been re-sealed and returned to learned counsel for the Commission.

4. In view thereof, the second prayer made by the petitioners can also not be accepted as this Court finds no justifiable ground to differ with the reasoned opinion of the subject experts against whom there are no allegations of any wrongdoing or *mala fide*. The assertion made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) that the said opinion cannot be believed in view of contrary opinion by two other experts appended to the petition, CWP-28611-2025, is also without substance. The first opinion is an email dated 18.08.2025, Annexure P-9, received from an expert who is stated to be a Professor working in the Department of Physics at the Indian Institute of Technology, Madras; and the second one is from a retired professor of Physics from the Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, Annexure P-10. *Firstly*, this Court has no reason to disbelieve the independent experts whose opinion has been sought by the Commission. They are senior faculty members in an institute, as already observed. *Secondly*, both the opinions relied upon by the petitioners do not categorically state that the questions in dispute are insolvable, as the first one is to the effect that there seems to be a

typing error which has serious consequences, and the second one also is more or less on the same lines. Accordingly, there is no definitive opinion to the contrary. Even if it were so, this Court would be loath to accept such opinions given to the candidates over the unflinching advice by senior experts in the field tendered to the recruiting agency which is a constitutional body.

5. In view thereof, there is no merit in the petitions and the same stand dismissed.
6. A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of the connected cases.

April 08, 2026
Jaspreet Kaur

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

✓
Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*