

**Ruby Attri v. State of H.P. & Ors.
CWP No.12345 of 2025**

07.04.2026 Present: M/s Gunjan Sharma and Arsh Chauhan, Advocates, for the petitioner.

Mr. Pushpinder Jaswal, Additional Advocate General, for respondents No.1.

Mr. Vikrant Thakur, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

Respondents No.3 and 4 ex parte.

Learned counsel for the Public Service Commission has handed over instructions, which stand perused. In said instructions, there is a note that there is a tie in paper-II between the last two selected candidates against general category and the petitioner has also obtained same marks in paper-II. It is further mentioned in the note that on the strength of the marks obtained by the candidates, petitioner would have got selected against general category, by virtue of his having obtained more marks in paper-I than the last two selected candidates against general category.

The Court further stands informed that the last two candidates who have been selected against the general category were belonging to Scheduled Tribe and EWS categories respectively, but they were selected against the general category seats in the selection process.

Learned counsel for the Commission submits that before the matter is heard any further, it would be in the interest of justice, if the candidate(s), who now would be affected by any order to be passed by the Court, are impleaded as party respondents in the petition.

This Court is of the considered view that before any such order is passed by the Court, let learned Additional Advocate General have instructions as to whether there is a post of Junior Auditor Class-III available in the State Audit Department belonging to general category or not. Instructions be obtained by the next date of hearing.

List on 13.05.2026.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

April 07, 2026
(*Vinod*)