

2025:PHHC:051905



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

239

**CWP-17167-2020  
Date of decision: 22.04.2025**

YESH PAL

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

HARYANA STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION

.....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

\*\*\*\*\*

Present: - Mr. Shalender Mohan, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapan Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

The petitioner raised a challenge to the final result dated 19.01.2019 to the extent of selection to the Group 'D' posts which is in contravention of the Selection criteria as five marks for the socio-economic/Orphan (father less child) to the petitioner has not been awarded.

2. Learned Counsel contends that the petitioner had applied against Group 'D' posts in the General category pursuant to the advertisement No. 4 of 2018. He contends that as per the result declared, the petitioner had obtained 60 marks in the written examination and that he was granted 05 marks for socio-economic criteria. He contends that he was entitled to 05 additional marks since father of the applicant had died before the applicant attained the age of 15 years. He contends that he did not claim



the said benefit at the stage of submission of the application form and it was contended before this Court at the time of hearing on 12.08.2024 that certain similarly placed candidates had not claimed the marks for the said category of father less/Orphan, yet, the said benefit had been extended. It was thus argued that similar benefit of 05 marks had been granted to persons other than the petitioner who had not filled in the above said category at the time of application, the said benefit ought to be extended to the petitioner as well and if such benefit is extended, his total marks would be 70 which would exceed the marks secured by the last selected candidate.

3. On noticing the aforesaid contention, the State Counsel was directed to complete instructions. On resumed hearing, the State Counsel on written instruction from the Secretary, Haryana Staff Selection Commission has informed that the contention of the petitioner to the effect that other similarly placed persons had been given the benefit of Orphan/father less category despite having not applied for the said benefit is factually incorrect. The tabulated details of the same are extracted as under:-

| Sr. No | Roll No.   | Name        | Cat | Marks Secured (Written + Socio Economic Experience) | Main Cut off | Waiting Cut Off | Whether socio-economic marks claimed/Granted or Not                  |
|--------|------------|-------------|-----|---|--------------|-----------------|--|
| 1      | 4181932413 | Mohit       | Gen | 53+10=63  | 69           | 68              | Socio Economic for No Govt. Job and marks of Orphan Claimed Granted. |
| 2      | 4181099560 | Arbar Ahmad | BCA | 47+5=52   | 63           | 62              | Socio Economic for No Govt. Job Claimed Granted.                     |
| 3      | 4182656332 | Aman        | BCA | 39+10=49  | 64           | 63              | Socio Economic for No Govt. Job and marks of Orphan Claimed Granted. |
| 4      | 4182243335 | Ravi Kumar  | Gen | 52+10=62  | 69           | 68              | Socio Economic for No Govt. Job and marks of Orphan                  |



|   |            |             |     |          |    |    |  |
|---|------------|-------------|-----|----------|----|----|--|
|   |            |             |     |          |    |    | Claimed Granted.   |
| 5 | 4181656333 | Karan Singh | Gen | 57+10=67 | 69 | 68 | Socio Economic for No Govt. Job and marks of Orphan Claimed Granted. |
| 6 | 4182313774 | Vikas       | Gen | 57+10=67 | 69 | 68 | Socio Economic for No Govt. Job and marks of Orphan Claimed Granted. |

4. It is averred that the candidates pointed out by the petitioner had claimed the marks in the said category while the petitioner had himself mentioned 'NO" against point No.4 of the socio-economic criteria i.e. "is applicant an Orphan and is the applicant the first or the second child and his/her father died before the applicant had attained the age of 15 years. He thus averred that since the petitioner did not mention anything regarding the death of his father in his application and mentioned "No" instead of "Yes" against the said column, hence, there was no error on the part of the Haryana Staff Selection Commission in awarding marks.

5. In view of the above, even if the benefit of 05 marks under the socio economic criteria is granted to the petitioner, his grant total would still be 65 marks which is below the cut off marks.

6. In view of the aforesaid, the present writ petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

APRIL 22, 2025

Vishal Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No