

2026:PHHC:001616



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

138

CWP-39510-2025

Date of decision: January 12, 2026

MANVI BREJA

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Pavan Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Sahni, Additional Advocate General, Haryana with
Mr. Harmanjit Singh Johal, Advocate.

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

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to interview the petitioner for the post of Assistant Professor (Computer Science) pursuant to advertisement 45/2024 dated 02.08.2024, Annexure P-1. And also, declare marks of all the candidates who have qualified the Subject Knowledge Test.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner applied for the post in question and cleared the Screening Test. She was called for the Subject Knowledge Test in terms of the Scheme of Examination notified in the advertisement, and cleared the same by obtaining the minimum requisite thirty-five per cent marks. Accordingly,

vide announcement dated 14.10.2025, she was called for document verification. After completing the verification final result of the Subject Knowledge Test was declared vide announcement dated 28.11.2025, Annexure P-10, wherein the candidates shortlisted for the next stage of selection, i.e., interview/viva-voce, were notified; but the petitioner's roll number, 50086, did not find mention there. The Commission has not declared the detailed result of Subject Knowledge Test, and there is no reason for excluding her from the final stage of selection/interview, especially when she has cleared the Test by obtaining the requisite thirty-five per cent marks.

3. Learned counsel for the Commission, on instructions from Mr. Narender, Assistant, submitted that as per the Scheme of Examination the procedure to interview the candidates, who appeared for the Subject Knowledge Test, is the following:

2. Subject Knowledge Test

(a) to (c) xxx xxx xxx

(d) The number of the candidates to be called for interview will be two times, including bracketed candidates if any, of the number of advertised posts provided that they have secured the minimum cut-off marks of 35%.

(e) The weightage of the subject knowledge test will be 87.5%.

Learned counsel also mentioned that after the petitioner obtained thirty-five per cent marks in the Subject Knowledge Test, she was called for document verification vide announcement dated 14.10.2025 to verify the conditions of her eligibility, as mentioned in the announcement itself. It was a process to ascertain the eligibility, and thereafter call the candidates for interview in

terms of Clause 2(d). After the process was undertaken, the requisite number of candidates were called for interview vide announcement dated 28.11.2025, wherein the petitioner's roll number did not figure as she failed to find place as per merit within two times the number of vacancies advertised. He further contends that as the process of selection is underway and interviews are yet to be conducted, the detailed marks of Subject Knowledge Test are not to be declared. In this regard, reliance has been placed upon the Supreme Court judgment in *Pranav Verma and others v. Registrar General of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh and another*, 2020 (15) SCC 377.

4. Submissions made by learned counsel for the parties have been considered.

5. It is apparent that the petitioner secured thirty-five per cent marks in the Subject Knowledge Test, but that does not assure shortlisting for the next stage of selection/interview as well. Clause 2(d) of the Scheme of Examination clearly stipulates that the number of candidates to be called for interview will be two times the number of advertised posts, provided they secure minimum cut-off marks of thirty-five per cent in the Test. Although the petitioner has secured the minimum cut-off marks of thirty-five per cent in the Test, she has failed to find place amongst candidates two times the number of posts advertised on merit. It goes without saying that declaration of marks of the Test at this stage will have consequences for the process of selection, as it can influence the final selection of candidates who are still to be interviewed. The law to that effect has been laid down in *Pranav Verma* case (*supra*), wherein while deciding the issue

whether the marks obtained in the main examination are to be disclosed before the viva-voce is conducted, the Court held as under:

27. As regards the petitioners' plea that marks of the Main Exam should be disclosed before conducting viva-voce, we are of the considered opinion that such a practice may not insulate the desired transparency, rather will invite criticism of likelihood of bias or favouritism. The broad principles to be laid down in this regard must be viewed keeping in view the selections for various categories of posts by different Selecting Authorities, for such a self-evolved criteria cannot be restricted to Judicial Services only. If the Members of the Interviewing Boards are already aware of the marks of a candidate secured in the Written Examination, they can individually or jointly tilt the final result in favour or against such candidate. The suggested recourse, thus, is likely to form bias affecting the impartial evaluation of a candidate in viva-voce. The acceptance of the plea of the petitioners in this regard will also run contrary to the authoritative pronouncement of this Court in *Ashok Kumar Yadav and Others v. State of Haryana*, (1985) 4 SCC 417. As the written examination assesses knowledge and intellectual abilities of a candidate, the interview is aimed at assessing their overall intellectual and personal qualities which are imperative to hold a judicial post. Any measure which fosters bias in the minds of the interviewers, therefore, must be done away with.

6. In view thereof, there is no ground to entertain the petition, and it stands dismissed.

January 12, 2026

Jaspreet Kaur

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*