GAHC010106392024

2026:GAU-AS:13087

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

Case No. : WP(C)/2971/2024

SUNIL BASFORE
S/O- GULTENI BASFORE, R/O- G.K ROAD, WARD NO-16,
DHUBRI, P.O- BIDYAPARA, P.S AND DIST- DHUBRI, ASSAM, PIN-783324

VERSUS

1: THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT AND ANR. REP. BY THE REGISTRAR GENERAL OF GAUHATI HIGH COURT, GUWAHATI, ASSAM, PIN-781001

2:THE REGISTRAR (VIGILANCE) CUM IN CHARGE RECRUITMENT CELL GAUHATI HIGH COURT ASSAM PIN-78100

For the Petitioner(s) **:** Mr. R.P. Kakoti, Sr. Advocate, assisted by Mr. A.B. Dey, Advocate.

For the Respondent(s) **:** Mr. T.J. Mahanta, Sr. Advocate/Standing Counsel, Gauhati High Court, assisted by Mr. A. Borua, Advocate.

– B E F O R E –
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. ASHUTOSH KUMAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN DEV CHOUDHURY

09.09.2026
(Ashutosh Kumar, CJ)

We have heard Mr. R.P. Kakoti, learned Senior Advocate, assisted by Mr. A.B. Dey, learned Advocate for the petitioner and Mr. T.J. Mahanta, learned Standing Counsel, Gauhati High Court, assisted by Mr. A. Borua, learned Advocate for both the respondents.

The petitioner, a Scheduled Caste candidate, is aggrieved by the rank-wise marks in the Grade-III Assam Judicial Service Examination

undertaken against the advertisement dated 06.02.2023. The rank-wise marks were published on 28.02.2024 in which the petitioner was shown to have obtained 252.83 marks as the total marks obtained by him, which was less than the cut-off for a candidate under the Scheduled Caste category for being offered the job. However, after having received his answer scripts through the RTI mechanism, he found that he was wrongly marked for 5(five) attempted questions, which assessment (correctness of the answer given by the petitioner) was made on the basis of academic authorities/texts, which, according to this Court, is largely inferential.

According to the petitioner, had he been marked appropriately, he would have got 257.83 marks, which was higher than the last selected Scheduled Caste candidate.

This remains the sole claim of the petitioner for pursuing this writ petition.

It may be stated here that 2(two) examination processes for Grade-III Assam Judicial Service Examination had been conducted thereafter. There is no definite information today as to the vacant seats. That apart, there is no challenge to the model key answers. The assessment of the petitioner, therefore, that he was marked less than what he deserved, is only inferential, on which assessment no order can be passed in the present writ petition.

The petition is bereft of merits and is, therefore, dismissed.

JUDGE **CHIEF JUSTICE**

Comparing Assistant