



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

**LPA No.202 of 2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 23.01.2025**

Gurjinder Singh

...Appellant

Versus

State of Union Territory Chandigarh & another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present:- Mr. Akshi Mehta, Advocate  
for the appellant.

Ms. Madhu Dayal, Addl. Standing counsel and  
Ms. Aashna Gill, Junior Panel counsel, U.T.  
for the respondents.

\* \* \* \*

**SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA J.(Oral)**

The appellant-writ petitioner assails the order passed by learned Single Judge dated 18.12.2024 and the decision of the Expert Committee whereby it rejected the objection raised by the writ petitioner who had appeared in the TGT recruitment examination held by the respondents for the period 22.06.2024 to 28.06.2024.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that Question No.47 in Part-A of Paper Booklet B was erroneous and the answers provided by all wrong and the said question should have been deleted and marks should have been awarded to the writ petitioner. If the said marks would have been allotted, the writ petitioner would have been in the merit. Learned



counsel submits that learned Single Judge has erred in rejecting the contentions of the writ petitioner. He further submits that the evidence placed along-with the objections was the same as has been relied upon by the concerned Expert Committee and the answer has been treated as correct which is wholly perverse.

3. We have been handed over the original Report and the Minutes of Meeting addressing the objections received by them against the General Question Paper of TGT Part-A Common Examination held on 01.08.2024 which reflects that the objections were addressed to and a Punjabi subject expert along-with Exam Section was assigned for resolving the objections received whereafter the Report was prepared and the Expert Committee has found that no change is required in Question No.47 Part A Set B. The original answer key has been found to be correct and no change has been advised by the Expert Committee. The Expert Committee has also made certain changes in relation to some other questions. Thus, we find that there has been an application of mind at the level of the Expert Committee. As regards the contention of learned counsel that the interpretation as taken by the Expert Committee is perverse as the document relied upon answers otherwise, we are unable to accept the contention as it is settled law that the concerned examiner or the expert, would have the expertise to reach to a particular conclusion. It is not uncommon that there may be different conclusions drawn by certain experts however one has to put an end to such controversies and if an expert has been called whose expertise is not under question before us, and he has given his opinion there is no occasion for this



Court who does not have any expertise in that regard to differ from his opinion or to question his opinion. The entire basis of examination is that we have to faith in our examiner and the experts. If a different view is taken, all the examinations would be under a scanner and there would be no end to such questions being raised by the candidates. The views taken by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in *Ran Vijay Singh and others vs. State of U.P and others (2018) 2 SCC 357* and *Uttar Pradesh Public Service Commission & Ors. vs. Rahul Singh & Ors., 2018 AIR (SC) 2861* are on the same aspect.

4. We, therefore, do not accept the contentions and the present appeal is accordingly dismissed.

5. The report received is handed over back to learned counsel for the respondents in a sealed cover.

6. All pending application(s) also stand disposed of.

**(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)**  
**JUDGE**

**January 23, 2025**  
seema

**(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)**  
**JUDGE**

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