
(2011) 05 UK CK 0107

In the Uttarakhand High Court

Case No : Writ Petition (S/S) No. 989 of 2010

Padmini Panwar

APPELLANT

Vs

Uttarakhand Public Service Commission

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-05-2011

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2011) 05 UK CK 0107

Hon'ble Judges : Sudhanshu Dhulia, J

Bench : Single Bench

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Sudhanshu Dhulia, J.—Heard Mr. Sandeep Tiwari, Advocate for the Petitioner and Mr. B.D. Kandpal, Advocate for the Respondent.

2. The Petitioner was a candidate for examination conducted by the Uttarakhand Public Service Commission (from hereinafter referred to as Commission) pertaining to the post of Assistant Review Officers (from hereinafter referred to as ARO) in State Secretariat and Commission.

3. The Petitioner qualified in the preliminary examination and thereafter gave the written examination. After the written examination, typing test of the Petitioner was taken. Since for the ARO, a minimum mark had to be obtained in the typing test, the Petitioner failed to procure this minimum mark. She has now filed this writ petition challenging the procedural error in the typing test such as wrong computers and key-pads being given to her, etc.

4. Mr. B.D. Kandpal, learned Counsel appearing for Commission has vehemently contested this allegation and stated that this was not so in any case and prior to the typing test, instructions had been given to the candidates. Had there been any fault in the computers or any such material given to the Petitioner, she should have complained of about this. These are factual disputes, which have been agitated in the writ petition. Nothing has been shown by the Petitioner on the materials presented by her to show that there was actually an error in the

typing test conducted by Commission. As such, the writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

5. No order as to costs.