

**CWP-8414-2016 (O&M)
and other connected cases**

2

2023:PHHC:071460

Versus

Punjab Public Service Commission and others

..Respondents

6.CWP-12463-2016 (O&M)

Neeru Bala

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..Respondents

Date of decision: 15.05.2023

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present:- Mr. D.S.Gandhi, Advocate for the petitioner
in CWP-12463-2016

Mr. Vikas Mohan Gupta, Addl. AG, Punjab

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J (Oral)

1. By this order, a batch of six civil writ petitions i.e CWP-8414-2016, 9116-2016, 9945-2016, 9473-2016, 9074-2016 and 12463-2016 involving identical issue, shall stand disposed of.

2. Pursuant to the recruitment notice issued by the Punjab Public Service Commission for the posts of the Deputy District Attorney and the Assistant District Attorney, a recruitment examination was held. There were two sets of paper i.e for criminal law and civil law. The question papers consisted of Multiple Choice Questions (MCQs) and the candidates were required to mark the correct answer out of the four options given under the question. After the examination was held, a provisional answer key was uploaded while inviting objections. An expert committee was constituted to examine the aforesaid objections

and based upon the aforesaid opinion of the experts, the result was revised.

3. Learned counsel representing the petitioner in CWP-12463-2016 contends that question paper no.2 was not sent to the expert committee. He admits that the petitioner did not file any objection to the proposed answer key of question paper no.2

4. Learned State counsel while referring to the separate written statement filed in various writ petitions contends that objections from a large number of candidates were received, which were forwarded to the expert committee and subsequently on the basis of the report, two answers to two different questions of civil law and three answers to the question paper of criminal law were corrected whereas three questions were deleted from the question paper. It has also been informed that on uniform basis, 1.5 marks were awarded to all the candidates. The scope of judicial review in such matters is extremely narrow in view of the judgments passed by the Supreme Court in *Vikesh Kumar Gupta vs. State of Rajasthan (2021) 12 SCC 309* and *Ran Vijay Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh (2018) 2 SCC 357*

5. The selection took place in the year 2016. The selected candidates have not been impleaded as parties, who are likely to be adversely affected.

6. In view of the aforesaid facts, no ground to issue the writ, as prayed for, is made out.

7. Hence, dismissed.

