


IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10123 of 2015



1. Rajnesh Kumar Gautam, Son of Arjun Prasad Chaudhary, resident of Room No. 39, D.H.-2, P.M.C.H., P.O. Bankipur, P.S. Pirbahore, District Patna.
2. Rajan Kumar, Son of Ratan Chaudhary, resident of Room No. 71, Nagarjun Hostel, P.M.C.H., P.O. Bankipur, P.s. Pirbahore, District Patna.
3. Vikash Kumar, Son of Sri Umesh Prasad, resident of Room No. 43, Dhanwantari Hostel, P.M.C.H., P.O. Bankipur, P.S. Pirbahore, District Patna.
4. Mithilesh Kumar, Son of Krishna Deo Mandal, resident of Room No.10, Dhanwantari Hostel, P.M.C.H., P.O. Bankipur, P.S. Pirbahore, District Patna.
5. Krishna Kumar, Son of Shiv Shankar Das, resident of Room No. 49, Dhanwantari Hostel, P.M.C.H., P.O. Bankipur, P.S. Pirbahore, District Patna.
6. Pramod Kumar Bharti, Son of Dularchandra Ram, resident of Room No. Bi, N.M.C., P.O. Agamkuan, P.S. Agamkuan, District Patna.
7. Manish Kumar, Son of Rajendra Ram, resident of Room No. 12, N.M.C., P.O. Agamkuan, P.S. Agamkuan, District Patna.
8. Manibhushan Kumar, Son of Ranjeet Chaudhary, resident of Room No. 25, N.M.C., P.O. Agamkuan, P.S. Agamkuan District Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Vice Chancellor, Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Chanakya National Law University Campus, Mithapur Farm Area, P.O. Mithapur, P.S. Jakkanpur, District Patna.
2. The Registrar, Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Chanakya National Law University Campus, Mithapur Farm Area, P.O. Mithapur, P.S. Jakkanpur, District Patna.
3. The Examination Controller, Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Chanakya National Law University Campus, Mithapur Farm Area, P.O. Mithapur, P.S. Jakkanpur, District Patna.

.... Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bipin Bihari Singh, Advocate with
Mr. Raju Prasad, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Abhay Shankar Singh with
Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocates

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)