



\$~130

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010377672026
+ **W.P.(C) 11756/2026**
MUKUL KAJAL

.....Petitioner

Through: None

versus

UNION OF INDIA

.....Respondents

Through: Mr Jagdish Chandra (CGSC), Mr.
Vanshul Pali (GP) along with Ms. Ayushika
Mishra, Ms. Maanya Saxena, Ms. Riya Garg, Mr.
Lakshay Kumar, Mr. Kartik Khullar, Advocates
for R1&3
Mr. Sanjay Khanna, Ms. Pragya Bhushan, Ms.
Jaya Choudhary, Ms. Meemansa Dixit, Mr. Naman
Dwivedi, Mr. Saurabh Pandey, Advs for NTA

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER
19.08.2026

%

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers :-

“a) Issue the /direction to appropriate writ/order the effect that the respondent No.2 and 3 be directed to produce the Petitioner's answer sheet (OMR sheet), of the NEET Test (UG)-2026 before this Hon'ble court and submit the final result of the Petitioner's said exam.

b) Issue the further ordered to the Respondents No.2 and 3



to prepare an expert report regarding discrepancies and the result the of Petitioner's above said exam of NEET Test (UG)-2026

c) It is further ordered the Respondents No.2 and 3 be directed to explain that how such huge discrepancies are occurred in the two OMR Sheet/Answer Petitioner's Sheet of the where the Petitioner is the one and the same person in the said two answer sheet.

d) It is further be ordered that a fair and independent enquiry must be done regarding the two answer sheet of the Petitioner's exam and explain why and how occurred therein such that discrepancies

e) It is further be ordered to the Respondents NO.2 and 3 to allow the medical Petitioner to join counseling program if he found eligible in the NEET Test (UG)-2026. . . .”

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner appeared for NEET (UG) 2026 on 21.06.2026 and the result of the same was declared on 16.07.2026, which was downloaded by the petitioner on 17.07.2026, wherein as per the petitioner, he obtained 605 marks out of 720 marks equivalent to overall 84.0135157 percentile.
3. Subsequently, the result was revised and the scorecard of the petitioner reflected his score as 60 marks out of total 720 marks. Hence the petition.
4. Mr. Khanna, learned counsel for the respondent No. 2/NTA has brought the original OMR sheet of the petitioner to Court today, which corresponds to Annexure P-4 of the present petition.



5. I have seen the original OMR sheet where the backside of the sheet contains the pen impression of bubbling i.e., darkening impression of the option which the petitioner marked for evaluation.
6. A perusal of Annexure P-2 of the present petition shows interpolation and the document appears to be created by the petitioner.
7. For questions, where the answer of the petitioner has been changed from the original OMR sheet, the options i.e. 1, 2, 3, 4 show somewhat a different colour.
8. For example, for the question No. 005 (as per original OMR sheet), the petitioner answered option No. 4. Whereas as per Annexure P-2 (the procured OMR), the petitioner has marked option No. 1 and option No. 4 is shown in somewhat different orange colour.
9. The same is the case with question No. 009 (original OMR – option 2) whereas in Annexure P-2 it is marked as Option No.1, and so on and so forth.
10. Since the OMR at Annexure P-4 matches with the original OMR sheet and neither the petitioner nor his counsel is present to take copy of the OMR sheet, attendance sheet and calculation sheet, copies of the same are taken on record.
11. The original OMR sheet and other records produced are returned to the respondent No. 2/NTA.
12. The petition is dismissed in the aforesaid terms, along with pending applications, if any.

JASMEET SINGH, J

AUGUST 19, 2026 / (MS)