



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Service Single No. 1585 of 2026

Akash Kumar

--Petitioner

Versus

Uttarakhand Public Service Commission

--Respondent

Presence:-

Mr. Brahm Dev, learned counsel for petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Miglani, learned counsel for respondent-Commission, through V.C.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J. (Oral)

Petitioner, by means of the present writ petition, challenged the notification dated 26.10.2024 (Annexure No.3 to the writ petition), whereby, certain changes were effected in the examination process for the post of Additional Private Secretary and other ancillary reliefs.

2. It is contended by learned counsel for petitioner that respondent-Commission issued advertisement dated 18.07.2024 inviting applications for the post of Additional Private Secretary in Uttarakhand Secretariat and Public Service Commission. Pursuant to the said advertisement, petitioner submitted his application form.

3. According to petitioner, as per the scheme of advertisement, written process has to be conducted in two legs. In first leg, five tests have to be undertaken by the candidate as follows:-

- i) Hindi Typing
- ii) English Typing
- iii) Computer Knowledge Test
- iv) Hindi Shorthand
- v) English Shorthand

4. It was provided that candidates successful in Hindi and English Typing shall be allowed to appear in Computer Knowledge Test and candidates successful in



Computer Knowledge Test will be declared eligible for Hindi and English Shorthand Test. English Shorthand Test will be preferential. In the second leg of the examination, two papers-one of General Studies and second Essay and Writing Skills shall be part of examination. Each paper will carry 100 marks and the paper of General Studies will be objective in nature while the second paper would be descriptive in nature. In the objective paper, the negative marks would be there.

5. It is contended by learned counsel for petitioner that during the selection process, the impugned notification was issued by the respondent-Commission dated 26.10.2024, by which, marks to be secured by the candidates appearing in first leg have been done away with and the tests of first leg of the examination were made only qualifying in nature.

6. It is further contended by him that petitioner participated in the first leg of the examination as per the change made by the respondent-Commission vide notification dated 26.10.2024 and he was successful in the qualifying paper. He participated in the second leg of examination, result of which is yet to be declared.

7. Learned counsel for petitioner contends that change brought about by the respondent-Commission during the examination process is illegal and the same could not have been done by the respondent-Commission during the selection process.

8. Per contra, learned counsel for respondent-Commission submits that earlier also the first leg examination/test was qualifying in nature and the only change which has been brought about by the respondent-Commission is of doing away the marks to be scored by the candidates.



9. He further submits that petitioner has participated in the examination and he has qualified in the qualifying examination, therefore, no prejudice is caused to the petitioner by change, whatsoever, made by the respondent-Commission.

10. He further contends that petitioner appeared in the second leg of the examination and the result of the said examination is yet to be declared. He also contends that writ petition is filed challenging the said notification dated 26.10.2024 is hit by the latches on the one hand and on the other hand, petitioner participated pursuant to the change made by the respondent-Commission and he was successful in the qualifying examination. In this view of the matter, the writ petition cannot be sustained.

11. Having considered the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and having perused the record of the case and the changes brought about by the respondent-Commission in examination pattern, this Court is of the view that since no prejudice has been caused to the petitioner, the writ petition cannot be maintainable at his behest. Secondly, by the change, only screening has to be done and the petitioner has already qualified in the screening test and thereafter appeared in the second leg of the examination, therefore, petitioner cannot challenge the said change made by respondent-Commission in the examination process.

12. Accordingly, no case of interference is made out and the writ petition is dismissed *in-limine*.

13. Pending application also stands disposed of.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)

17.06.2026