

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 22236 of 2010

DATE OF DECISION: December 14, 2010

Kashmir Singh Basson

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

Punjab Public Service Commission and another

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAI LAMBA

Present: Mr. S.R. Chaudhari, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

AJAI LAMBA, J. (ORAL)

1. This civil writ petition filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India seeks issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent-authorities to issue admit card and Roll No. to the petitioner to enable him to take preliminary exam for Punjab Civil Services (Competitive Examination), 2009 scheduled to be held on 19.12.2010.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner filled a wrong code in the application form which is an error which needs to be corrected. It has further been contended that in response to public notice (Annexure P-4), the petitioner filed a representation before the scheduled date i.e. 31.08.2010, however, copy of the same was not retained and, therefore, could not be placed on record for consideration of the Court.

3. I have considered the contention of the learned counsel.

4. It is the admitted case that the petitioner did not fill the correct code. The petitioner was required to fill code 77 in category code list. The

petitioner, however, filled 78 instead. On considering the two categories, I find that the petitioner in fact gave wrong information in the application form and, therefore, the respondents were within their rights to show the petitioner ineligible, he having filled the wrong code. Petitioner has applied for PCS Executive Branch passed which carries heavy responsibilities. Certain level of awareness is required which I find lacking in the petitioner and, therefore, even in equity the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. This is particularly so because alongwith application form, detailed brochure had been issued which gives the details of manner in which the application form is to be filled. Despite such help, the petitioner filled the wrong code.

5. Considering the totality of facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find that extra ordinary writ jurisdiction can be invoked so as to judicially review the decision of the respondents.

6. Petition dismissed.

14.12.2010
shivani

(AJAI LAMBA)
JUDGE

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?