



130
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-12561-2026
DECIDED ON: 24.04.2026

MOHD PARVEJ KHAN

....PETITIONER

VERSUS

HARYANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Gurnoor Sandhu, Advocate for respondent -HPSC.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J

Prayer

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of directions to the respondent-Commission to permit the petitioner to appear in the Haryana Civil Services (Executive Branch) and Allied Services Examination pursuant to Advertisement No. 22/2026 by issuing the requisite roll number/admit card for the preliminary examination.

Brief Facts

2. The petitioner completed his matriculation examination from the Central Board of Secondary Education in the year 2017 and Senior Secondary Examination in the year 2019. Thereafter, he obtained the degree of Bachelor of Technology in Electronics and Computer Engineering from JC Bose University of Science and Technology, YMCA, Faridabad in May 2024.



3. Pursuant to Advertisement No. 22/2026 issued by the respondent for recruitment to the posts of HCS (Executive Branch) and other allied services, the petitioner submitted his online application form on 26.02.2026 along with the prescribed examination fee within the stipulated period. According to the petitioner, the application form and fee were duly accepted by the online portal.

4. The grievance raised in the petition is that the petitioner did not receive any communication from the respondent regarding any alleged deficiency or requirement for updation of the online application form, particularly with respect to the signed application form. The petitioner asserts that he came to know about such requirement subsequently through other sources, whereafter he submitted a representation dated 07.03.2026 requesting the respondent to accept his candidature and issue the roll number. It has been pleaded that despite submission of representation and reminder, no response was received from the respondent. The preliminary examination pursuant to the aforesaid advertisement was scheduled to be conducted on 26.04.2026, however, no roll number/admit card was issued to the petitioner.

5. Aggrieved against the action of the respondent in not permitting him to participate in the examination, the petitioner has approached this Court through the present writ petition.

Contentions

On the behalf of petitioner

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that pursuant to Advertisement No. 22/2026, the petitioner submitted his online application form within the prescribed time along with the requisite examination fee, which was



duly accepted by the respondent. It is submitted that the petitioner was never informed about any alleged defect or deficiency in the application form, particularly with regard to updation of the signed application form, and came to know about the same only subsequently through other sources. Counsel submits that upon learning of the alleged deficiency, the petitioner immediately submitted a representation dated 07.03.2026 requesting acceptance of his candidature and issuance of roll number/admit card.

7. It is further contended that despite submission of the representation and reminders, no response was furnished by the respondent nor any opportunity was granted to the petitioner to rectify the alleged defect. Learned counsel submits that the omission, if any, is purely technical in nature and does not affect the eligibility of the petitioner. On this basis, it has been argued that denial of permission to appear in the preliminary examination scheduled on 26.04.2026 is arbitrary and unjustified, and a direction deserves to be issued to the respondent to permit the petitioner to participate in the examination.

On the behalf of Respondent

8. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-Commission submits that the petitioner failed to complete the application process in terms of the conditions stipulated in Advertisement No. 22/2026, inasmuch as the duly signed application form was not uploaded within the prescribed time. It is contended that as per the terms of the advertisement, submission of the signed application form was mandatory and the application process could be treated as complete only upon compliance thereof. Counsel submits that mere submission of



the online form and deposit of fee did not confer any indefeasible right upon the petitioner to participate in the examination.

9. Reliance has been placed by the learned counsel upon the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in *Aditi versus State of Haryana and another*, LPA-2753-2024, decided on 12.11.2024, to contend that even where a candidate alleges technical glitch, such plea cannot be accepted when sufficient time remained available to complete the application process within the prescribed schedule. It is argued that adherence to the conditions and timelines contained in the advertisement is mandatory and any relaxation at this stage would disturb the selection process and result in administrative uncertainty.

Analysis

10. It is not disputed that pursuant to Advertisement No. 22/2026, the petitioner submitted the online application form and deposited the requisite examination fee. It is, however, equally not in dispute that the petitioner failed to upload the duly signed application form within the stipulated period, though the advertisement specifically provided that the application process would stand completed only upon submission of the signed application form. The conditions contained in the advertisement were clear, unambiguous and binding upon all candidates alike.

11. The principal contention raised on behalf of the petitioner is that he was not informed regarding the alleged deficiency and that the omission was technical in nature. The said submission cannot be accepted. Once the terms of the advertisement expressly required completion of the application process through



uploading of the duly signed application form, it was incumbent upon the petitioner to ensure compliance thereof within the prescribed time. Mere submission of the online form and payment of fee could not dispense with the mandatory requirement stipulated in the advertisement.

12. This issue is no longer res integra. The Division Bench of this Court in the judgement rendered in *Aditi versus State of Haryana and another, LPA-2753-2024* decided on 12.11.2024, while dealing with an identical controversy, held that where sufficient time remained available to complete the application process, the plea of technical glitch cannot be accepted in absence of any material showing continuous efforts on the part of the candidate to rectify the defect within the prescribed period. The Division Bench further held that adherence to the terms and timelines contained in the advertisement is mandatory and any relaxation would disturb the selection process.

13. It is worth noticing that even in the present case, except making a bald assertion regarding non-receipt of communication, the petitioner has failed to show that the mandatory requirement of uploading the signed application form was complied with within time. The conditions of the advertisement having not been challenged, the petitioner cannot seek relaxation contrary thereto. Granting such indulgence in favor of one candidate would amount to rewriting the terms of the advertisement and would be unfair to other candidates who complied with the prescribed procedure within time.



Conclusion

14. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case and the settled legal position governing the field, this Court finds no merit in the present writ petition. The petitioner having failed to comply with the mandatory requirement of uploading the duly signed application form within the stipulated time, no indefeasible right accrues in his favour to seek participation in the selection process.

15. Hence, the present writ petition is dismissed.

24.04.2026

Meenu

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*