



CWP-8454-2025

-1-

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

117

CWP-8454-2025

Date of Decision:08.04.2025

Rekha Rani

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Mr. Ankur Sidhar, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate for respondent no.3/HPSC

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to allow re-checking/re-evaluation inspection of the petitioner's answersheet of the Subject Knowledge Test, dated 19.01.2025, for the post of PGT Economics in response to advertisement 21/2024.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner has restricted his prayer only to inspection of the answer-sheet. He contends that the petitioner cleared screening test for the post by securing sixth position under EWS category, but was declared unsuccessful in the Subject Knowledge Test as per the result announced on 13.03.2025 which is doubtful. She therefore is entitled to inspect/see the answer sheet which has not been allowed by the Commission for no valid reasons. He has referred to an announcement dated 19.02.2025, Annexure P-10, issued by the Commission allowing candidates for the posts of Ayurvedic Medical Officer (Group-B) to inspect their answer



sheets of Subject Knowledge Test, but the same procedure is not being followed for the selection in question, which is arbitrary. In support of the contentions, he has relied upon a judgment by the Supreme Court rendered in *Mradul Mishra v. Chairman U.P. Public Service Commission Allahabad and another*, 2018(3) RCR (Civil) 842.

3. Learned counsel for the Commission, on the contrary, submits that at this stage inspection cannot be allowed because of the scheme of examination notified in the advertisement itself. For selection, the weightage of Subject Knowledge Test is 87.5 per cent, and that of Interview is 12.5 per cent. So far the Commission has conducted the Test but the date of interview is still to be announced. Accordingly, during the process of examination the candidates cannot be allowed to inspect the answer sheets. He further submits that the reliance placed upon announcement, dated 19.02.2025, issued by the Commission allowing the candidates for the post of Ayurvedic Medical Officer to inspect the answer sheets is besides the point. The final result for this post was announced on 05.02.2025, and only thereafter the candidates were allowed to inspect the answer sheets vide public notice dated 19.02.2025. The same process will be followed in the case as well, and after completion of the selection process, the candidates will be permitted to inspect the answer sheets.

4. Heard.

5. As per undisputed facts on record, selection for the post in question has not been concluded as yet. It consists of Subject Knowledge Test as well as Interview/*viva voce*, which is still to be conducted. Accordingly, in case it has been decided not to allow the inspection of test answer sheets in the midst of selection process, no exception can be taken to it. More so, the



Commission has itself undertaken to allow the inspection after finalisation of the selection process. Further, the judgment in *Mradul Mishra* case (*supra*) has no application to the facts of this case as it has dealt with the issue, whether an examining body holds the evaluated answer books in a fiduciary relationship and can refuse its disclosure. The issue was decided by holding otherwise and directing that the same should be allowed to be inspected in public interest and to ensure transparency without disclosing identity of the examiner. The direction cannot be read to mean that even during the process of selection the answer sheets should be allowed to be inspected by the candidates.

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

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

08.04.2025

Payal

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