



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CWP-6967-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 26.08.2025

SANDEEP KUMAR

...Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present:- Mr. Gurvinder Pal Singh, Advocate for
Mr. P.S. Khurana, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Arora, Senior Panel Counsel,
for the respondents-UI.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the order dated 19.02.2019 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'), by which, the prayer of the petitioner that the promotions, which were made from group 'C' to group 'B' including to the post of Assistant Engineer by the respondent-department on the basis of written examination, should be re-evaluated and that too, by an independent agency as the petitioner, who claims himself to be a meritorious, has not been found successful in the relative merit list prepared by the respondents for effecting such promotion from group 'C' to group 'B', which is causing prejudice.

2. On being asked to point out that whether there is any provision



for re-evaluation of the written examination, learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to show that there exists any provision for re-evaluation of the answer sheets as being claimed by the petitioner.

3. The said issue has been looked into by the Tribunal while passing the order dated 19.02.2019 and keeping in view the settled principle of law, which have also been noticed in the said order passed by the Tribunal, no re-evaluation can be undertaken in the absence of any such provision and that too only on the apprehension that the petitioner was awarded less marks.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to prove that the order passed by the Tribunal declining the re-evaluation, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, is perverse either on fact or law.

5. The interference can only be done by this Court in appeal when order impugned is proved to be perverse either on fact or on law, which has not been done in the facts and circumstances of the present case. No ground is made to accept the prayer made by the petitioner in the present writ petition. Hence, the same is dismissed.

6. Pending applications stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

August 26, 2025
harish

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No

