



CWP-24861-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

116

CWP-24861-2025

Date of Decision: 26.08.2025

Anjali Choudhary

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Jatin Bansal, Advocate and  
and Mr. Mohan Lal, Advocate (*through video conferencing*)  
for the petitioner

Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubbar, Additional  
Advocate General, Haryana

\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J.** (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of revised result dated 28.06.2024.

2. The petitioner, pursuant to Advertisement No.5/2023 dated 29.09.2023, applied for the post of Scientific Staff (Group-C) for Forensic Science Laboratory. She applied under Scheduled Caste Category. She appeared in the written test. The respondent uploaded answer key on its website. The final result was declared on 14.03.2024 wherein name of the petitioner did not figure in the list of successful candidates. She sought information under Right to Information Act, 2005 (for short 'RTI Act') with respect to her OMR Sheet, marks awarded for OMR highlighted answers



and status of objections raised by her with respect to 11 questions. Many candidates challenged result before this Court. The matter reached went to the Division Bench of this Court by way of LPA No.1037 of 2023 which directed the respondent to revise the result. The respondent unsuccessfully preferred Special Leave Petition before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In view of directions of this Court, the respondent on 28.06.2024 declared revised result. The name of petitioner did not figure in the revised result. She again filed application dated 10.07.2024 under RTI Act seeking her OMR sheet and details of marks awarded to her. She, from time to time, was supplied information under RTI Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that with respect to correctness of 11 questions, objection to answer key was submitted within the permissible time, however, respondent did not redress her grievance.

4. Learned State counsel submits that objections with respect to correctness of answer key could be submitted by 11.12.2023 as answer key was uploaded on 07.12.2023. There is nothing on record disclosing that petitioner submitted her objections during the permissible period.

5. I have heard the arguments of learned counsel for both sides and perused the record with their able assistance.

6. From the perusal of record, it is evident that result, at the first instance, was declared on 14.03.2024. This Court vide judgment dated 31.05.2024 passed in *LPA No.1037 of 2023* declared marks for socio-economic criteria invalid, thus, respondent revised result on 28.06.2024. The petitioner remained dormant till revision of result. She did not file objections



within permissible period. There is bald statement of filing objections. The petitioner has approached this Court after one year even from the date of declaration of revised result. She is assailing correctness of answer key. This Court, at this stage, especially when candidates have already been selected, does not find it appropriate to interfere with revised result.

7. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that present petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

**(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**26.08.2025**

*Mohit Kumar*

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