



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

**CWP-26380 of 2025
Reserved on:- 09.09.2025
Date of Pronouncement:12.09.2025**

GURPREET KAUR AND ANOTHER

....Petitioners

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER.

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY, JUDGE**

Present:- Mr. Shailendra Sharma, Advocate (Arguing counsel), and
Mr. Charanjit lal, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Vipin Pal Yadav, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab.
Ms. Harpriya Khaneka, Advocate for respondent-2, High Court.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE

1. This petition has been filed by two aspirants, who were unsuccessful in the selection for appointment to the post of Additional District & Sessions Judge in the cadre of Superior Judicial Service in the State of Punjab under the 25% direct quota reserved for the Bar, for which an advertisement was issued, vide notification No.111 Gaz.I/VI.F.2 dated 01.06.2025 (Annexure P-1). The candidature of the petitioners came to be rejected on the ground that they had not affixed their signatures on all pages of the application form, as mandated under Clause 10.9 of the advertisement.

2. This Court has decided a similar matter on an earlier occasion while dismissing *CWP-25933 of 2025* titled as '*Anuj Dahiya Versus State of Haryana and Another*' decided on 02.09.2025, pertaining the State of



Haryana. Thus, this Court need not indulge into prolixity of adjudication in the present matter.

3. However, the learned counsel for the petitioners raises another ground that the mistake of non-signing by the petitioners on every page of the application form as required under Clause 10.9 of the advertisement (Annexure P-1), is a mere irregularity, which ought not to come in the way of the petitioners' right to be considered for public employment enshrined in Article 16 of the Constitution of India.

3.1 In support of the aforesaid contention, the learned counsel for the petitioners has not been able to cite any judgment.

3.2 To the contrary, learned counsel for respondent no.2-High Court has cited Full Bench of this Court, comprising of three Judges rendered on 16.05.1997 titled as '**Rahul Prabhakar Versus Punjab Technical University, Jalandhar**', (1997) SCC Online P&H 528 and the Division Bench Judgment of the Madhya Pradesh High Court rendered on 26.08.2020 titled as '**Reena Dubey Versus State of M.P. and Another**', WP No. 536 of 2020 to emphasise that the last date and time mentioned in the advertisement are sacrosanct and cannot be changed or altered merely on the whims and fancies of the candidate concerned.

3.3 So far as the fundamental right under Article 16 of the Constitution is concerned, it is obvious from the reading of text of Article 16 that equality of opportunity is provided to all citizens in matters of public employment to any office under the State. In the instant case, no doubt, the post concerned relates to public office, but the petitioners are not the only ones whose applications were rejected for failing to sign on every page of the



CWP-26380 of 2025

application forms. Other similarly situated candidates were treated in the same manner.

3.4 Thus, it cannot be said that the petitioners have been discriminated. The employer has treated all the eligible candidates with the same yardstick, as prescribed in the advertisement. Thus, the petitioners cannot complain that the mistake committed in not signing on every page of the application is a mere technical or procedural lapse or a mere irregularity.

4. Consequently, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and declines interference.

5. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

**(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE**

12.09.2025

Kamal Gandhi

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No
Whether reportable Yes/No