

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9288 of 2015

- =====
1. Abhay Kumar Son of Krishna Kumar Singh resident of Room No. 39 , D.H. -2 , P.M.C.H. , P.O. Bankipur, P.S. Pirbahore, District - Patna.
 2. Md. Amber, Son of Md. Kauser, resident of Danwantari Hostel, Room No. 27, near O.B.H. ground, P.O. Bankipur, P.S. Pirbahore, District Patna.
 3. Gaurav Gajendra Son of Sidheshwar Chaudhary, Room no. 37, D.H. - 2, P.M.C.H., P.O. Bankipur, P.S. Pirbahore, District Patna.
 4. Vikash Kumar Son of Shivji Ram resident at Room no. 36, D.H.- 2 , P.M.C.H., P.O. Bankipur, P.S. Pirbaore, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Vice Chancellor, Aryabhatta Knowledge University campus, Mithapur Farm Area , P.O. Mithapur, P.S. Jakkanpur, District Patna.
2. The Registrar , Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Chanya National Law University Campus , Mithapur Fram Area , P.O.. Mithapur, P.S. Jakkanpur, District Patna.
3. The Examination Controller, Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Chankya National Law University campur, Mithapur Fram Area, P.O. Mithapur, P.S. Jakkanpur, District- Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bipin Bihari Singh, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Abhay Shankar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI
ORAL ORDER

3 10-08-2015 Much was sought to be made by learned counsel for the petitioners with regard to rejection of the prayer by the respondent University authorities specially the Vice Chancellor regarding re-evaluation of the answer sheets of the petitioners as well as recalculation of marks awarded to them.

Though the Court is not an expert of experts as is generally urged at the bar but even by use of common sense and knowledge some of the answers given by the petitioners to the

questions are outlandish. The Court has gone through the answer sheets which have been annexed by the petitioners with the reply to the counter affidavit. The depth of knowledge of the petitioners is evident from the quality of the answers given by them.

The respondents have taken a stand that the answer sheets were produced before the experts who after going through answer sheets of examinees including the petitioners, opined that no case for re-evaluation is required. The marking/totaling has also been gone through and the marks awarded to the petitioners have been found to be in order.

The court is not willing to exercise its discretion over and above what the authorities have done after due exercise on the demand for re-evaluation.

The writ application is dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

ahk/-

U			
---	--	--	--