

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

113

CWP-19660-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 02.07.2026

Angrej Brar

...Petitioner(s)

Vs.

**State of Haryana, Department of Personnel
and Training through its Secretary and another**

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTAPresent:- Ms. Savita Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

NIDHI GUPTA, J.

Present Civil Writ Petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed by the petitioner for issuance of an appropriate Writ especially in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondent no.2 to accept the Application form no. ADA32185 (Annexure P-2) for the exam of Assistant District Attorney in Prosecution Department to be conducted on 05.07.2026 Advertisement no. 18/2025 (Published vide dated 08.08.2025-Annexure P-1) and issue the E-Admit Card for the petitioner in the interest of Justice.

2. It is *inter alia* submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that respondent No.2 had published an Advertisement dated 08.08.2025 (Annexure P-1) for recruitment of Assistant District Attorney in the Prosecution Department in the State of Haryana. Opening date for



submission of form was 13.08.2025; and closing date was 02.09.2025. Petitioner had submitted his application bearing No. ADA32185 (Annexure P-2) online with all the relevant documents and information within the stipulated period and requisite fees. It is submitted that initial date of issuance of E-Admit Card was 21.06.2026 which was later extended to 27.06.2026. On 27.06.2026 when petitioner had tried to get his E-Admit Card for examination, he discovered that his E-Admit Card had not been issued as his application form (Annexure P-2) has been rendered "INCOMPLETE".

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner refers to averments made in para 5 of the Writ Petition, which reads as follows, to submit that: -

"That the petitioner came to know that after submission of the form, he was supposed to again get a Printout of his form and convert it into a PDF form and upload the same on the Portal. It was something technical that did not occur to the petitioner while submitting his online application since it did not show any mandatory Tab for the same before Submission of the Application was completed."

4. Ld. Counsel contends that the aforesaid reason could not be used to create obstacle in the process of issuing E-Admit Card to the petitioner. It is contended that the same is a mere technical issue and should not be made a reason to block the future career of the petitioner. It is accordingly prayed that the petitioner be granted an opportunity to upload the PDF form of his application form pursuant to which a



direction be issued to the respondents to issue E-Admit Card to the petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent-State vehemently opposes submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner and submits that E-Admit Card could not be issued to the petitioner due to his own mistake. It is submitted that therefore, the present Writ Petition deserves to be dismissed.

6. No other argument is raised on behalf of Id. counsel for the parties. I have heard Id. counsel and perused the case file in detail. I find no merit in the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner.

7. It is the admitted case of the petitioner himself that E-Admit Card could not be issued due to own mistake of the petitioner, as, the petitioner failed to get a printout of the application form, convert it into PDF, and upload it on the portal. The above reflects the rank carelessness on part of the petitioner in submitting the application.

8. In fact, the above submissions and averments made by the petitioner show utter lackadaisical attitude and carelessness on the part of the petitioner *in as much* as the Advertisement is dated 08.08.2025; and application was submitted in time by 02.09.2025. Date of issuance of E-Admit card was extended to 27.06.2026. During the long intervening period from 02.09.2025 till 27.06.2026, petitioner made no attempt to confirm that his application form was in order; or to verify that his application form had been submitted in accordance with the rules and regulations. In fact, petitioner has stated in para 4 of the



present Writ Petition that on 29.06.2026 after travelling from his native place, he reached the Office of the respondent no.2 and there with the assistance of a Clerical staff, he came to know about the issue with his application form. Merely to say "*mistake on the part of the petitioner was due to oversight and not intentional*" is not a sufficient ground to interfere with the examination process and that too when the examination is going to be held on 05.07.2026; especially as the petitioner himself has failed to comply with the stipulated requirements.

9. Contention of the petitioner that his computer related knowledge is still not vast, is baseless as computers are omnipresent and essential for survival in today's age. The same constitutes no ground for issuance of direction as prayed for.

10. It is to be appreciated that it is imperative that simple instructions and timelines stipulated in submitting application forms, be adhered to. This is necessary not just to maintain the sanctity of the process but also to prevent possible chaos that would result if rules and conditions are permitted to be flouted or are not adhered to. This discipline and alertness is especially required if the candidate is aspiring to a public position.

11. In similar circumstances, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Mohit Kumar v. State of Uttar Pradesh, (SC) : Law Finder Doc Id # 2730841, decided on 15.05.2025**; has succinctly and sagely advised as under: -

"A. Recruitment Process - Requirement of submitting caste certificate in prescribed format - Adherence to recruitment notification mandatory - Held, terms of



advertisement/notification regulating recruitment process must be scrupulously followed - Non-compliance would result in adverse consequences for aspirants Aspirants failing to submit requisite certificate in prescribed format treated as candidates of unreserved category.”

The relevant para of the said judgment reads as under:-

“19. It is no longer res integra that terms of an advertisement issued in connection with a selection process are normally not open to challenge unless the challenge is founded on the ground of breach of Article 16 of the Constitution or, for that matter, Article 14. Once an advertisement is issued inviting applications for public employment, it is the responsibility, nay duty, of an aspirant to read and note the terms and understand what its requirements are. If any aspirant finds any of the terms ambiguous and there is scope for an inquiry inbuilt in the advertisement or is provided by any rule/regulation, an effort ought to be first made to obtain clarity for understanding the requirements accurately. If no such scope is available, nothing prevents the aspirant from seeking clarity by making a representation. Should such clarity be not provided, the aspirant may participate in the process without prejudice to his rights and may question the term even after he is not selected. However, if the aspirant does not make any such effort and takes a calculated chance of selection based on his own understanding of the disputed term in the advertisement and later, he emerges unsuccessful, ordinarily, it would not be open to him to challenge the selection on the ground that the disputed term is capable of being understood differently. In such cases, the courts should be loath to entertain such plea of ambiguity while preferring to accept the recruiting authority's understanding of the said term. This is for the simple reason



that the recruiting authority is the best judge of what its requirements are and it is such understanding of the recruiting authority that would matter most in cases brought up before the courts; hence, after commencement of the process wherein aspirants have participated without raising any demur as to what a particular terms means, even if any of the terms be ambiguous, the courts should lean in favour of the recruiting authority.”

12. Accordingly, in view of the above noted factual and legal position, the present Civil Writ Petition stands **dismissed**.

13. Pending application(s) if any also stand(s) disposed of.

02.07.2026

Divyanshi

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE