

GAHC010207962016



THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/6472/2016

MADHUSMITA PODDAR
D/O SRI MOHAN CHANDRA PODDAR R/O FATASHIL, AMBARI NEAR
MAYUR KRISHNA CINEMA HALL GUWAHATI- 781025.

VERSUS

THE GAUHATI UNIVERSITY and 4 ORS.
JALUKBARI, GUWAHATI -15.

2:THE REGISTRAR

GAUHATI UNIVERSITY JALUKBARI
GUWAHATI -15.

3:THE CONTROLLER OF EXAMINATIONS
GAUHATI UNIVERSITY

4:CENTRAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
KOKRAJHAR
BTAD
ASSAM- 783370
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR.

5:THE DIRECTOR

CENTRAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KOKRAJHAR
BTAD
ASSAM- 783370
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR

Advocate for the Petitioner : MS.A B KAYASTHA

Advocate for the Respondent :

**BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N. UNNI KRISHNAN NAIR**

ORDER

Date : 08.02.2024

Heard Mr. R. Dubey, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. P. J. Phukan, learned standing counsel representing the Gauhati University.

At the outset, Mr. Dubey, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he would not be arguing any other point, but, would limit his arguments to the question as to whether the University authorities have carried out the re-evaluation exercise with regard to the paper of the petitioner pertaining to Engineering Mathematics-I (MA 101) by appointment of an alternative examiner other than the examiner who had earlier evaluated the said answer script of the petitioner.

Mr. Phukan, learned standing counsel, responding to the said contention has placed before this Court a communication received by him from the Controller of Examination, Gauhati University, wherein it has been stated that two evaluators were engaged to evaluate the two separate sections available in that paper. It is the further contention of Mr. Phukan, learned standing counsel that the two evaluators now engaged had not evaluated the said paper of the petitioner earlier.

In that view of the matter, it being demonstrated by the authorities of Gauhati University that the re-evaluation of the Engineering

Mathematics-I (MA 101) paper of the petitioner to have been so done by a separate set of examiners, the apprehension as raised by Mr. Dubey, learned counsel for the petitioner, in this connection, no longer subsists and there being no other grounds urged in the present proceedings, no further issue remains for adjudication herein. Accordingly, the writ petition stands closed. However, there would be no order as to costs.

The communication as produced by Mr. P. J. Phukan, learned standing counsel for the Gauhati University is returned to him.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant