



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

138

CWP-27467-2025

Date of Decision:- 16.09.2025

PARDEEP KUMAR

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Additional A.G. Haryana.

Ms. Harpriya Khaneka, Advocate  
for respondent No.2-High Court.

\* \* \* \*

**SHEEL NAGU, C.J. (Oral)**

1. The present petition has been filed by an aspirant for the post of Additional District & Sessions Judge in the cadre of Haryana Superior Judicial Service by way of direct recruitment under the 25% quota reserved for the Bar.
2. It is not disputed that the written examination starts from 19.09.2025.
3. The ground on which the candidature of the petitioner has been rejected is that he has answered "yes" instead of "no" in column No.6 in answer to the query "*Do you have more than one spouse living?*", in his application preferred for aforesaid recruitment.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the name



of the spouse has been mentioned as “Preeti” in Column No.6, then it should have been presumed that he has only one wife and not more than one.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No.2-High Court, who appears on advance notice, has drawn the attention of this Court to Clauses 4.1, 10.7 and 10.8 of the Notification dated 01.06.2025, which are reproduced hereinbelow for ready reference and convenience:-

***“4. DISQUALIFICATION FOR APPOINTMENT:-***

*No person shall be qualified for appointment to the service or being in service:*

*4.1 If he/she has more than one spouse living;*

*xx-----xx-----xx*

*10.7 Candidates should fill all details, including the category, correctly in application form after ensuring that all the particulars/details are correctly mentioned in it. No request for any change in the Application Form shall be entertained at later stage.*

*10.8 Candidates will be responsible for any mistake committed in the application form and the High Court shall not be responsible or liable in any manner. Any information submitted by a candidate in the application form will bind him/her personally and if such information is found to be false, then the candidate shall be liable for criminal prosecution apart from consequences under civil law, as may be deemed proper.”*

6. From the aforesaid, it is evident that a candidate has to be extremely careful and vigilant while filling up his application form, since slightest of mistake (advertent or inadvertent) can entail cancellation of candidature. In a competitive examination, adherence to the timelines is of vital importance since recruitment process once commenced cannot be stalled or delayed due to inadvertent mistake of any candidate.

7. Moreso, every candidate is required to submit a declaration that any incorrect, false and concealment of information would render the candidature cancelled and that all the terms and conditions in the



Notification are binding on the candidates.

8. Therefore, in view of the above, and also in light of the law laid down by the Apex Court in the cases of *Lachmi Narain and others Vs. Union of India and others (1976) 2 SCC 953 [para 68]*; *N.T. Devin Katti and others Vs. Karnataka Public Service Commission and others (1990) 3 SCC 157 [para 11]*; *State of Bihar and others Vs. Madhu Kant Ranjan and another (2021) 17 SCC 141 [para 11]* and by the Full Bench of this Court in the case of *Rahul Prabhakar Vs. Punjab Technical University Jalandhar, (1997) SCC Online P&H 528*, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and declines interference.

9. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

(SHEEL NAGU)  
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SANJIV BERRY)  
JUDGE

16.09.2025

S.Sharma

i)	<i>Whether speaking/reasoned?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
ii)	<i>Whether reportable?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>