

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17961 of 2016

=====

Kritichandrayan, D/o Vibhuti Pandey resident of Village- Chand, P.O.- Chand, District- Kaimur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary, Secondary Education, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Chairman, Bihar School Examination Board, Patna.
3. The Secretary, Bihar School Examination Board, Patna.
4. The Principal, Gandhi Smarak High School Chand, P.S.- Chand, District- Kaimur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajay Nandan Sahay, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Prabhat Ranjan Singh, AC to AAG15
For the BSEB	:	Mr. Girijesh Kumar, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 10-08-2017

This application has been filed by the petitioner, who had appeared for matriculation examination, held in the year 2015, for re-evaluation of her answer-sheets of the subjects, Hindi, Sanskrit and Science, since, according to her, she has been awarded less marks than she deserved.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Bihar School Examination Board (*in short 'Board'*).

3. From the pleadings on record, it appears that the petitioner had applied for scrutiny of her answer-sheets, which was done in the year 2015 itself. From the statement made in



paragraph 10 of the writ application, it appears that on scrutiny, in one of the papers, the Board decided to enhance the marks, but no alteration in other subjects was allowed by the Board. It has not been stated as to when the decision on petitioner's application for scrutiny of answer-sheets was communicated to her. In October, 2016, this application has been filed for reevaluation of the answer-sheets.

4. The relief sought for by the petitioner, in the present application, cannot be allowed for two reasons. Firstly, there is delay in approaching the Court, inasmuch as the examination is of year 2015, whereas, the petitioner has approached this Court in October, 2016 for re-evaluation of the answer-sheets. Secondly, the Rules do not permit re-evaluation of answer-sheets and there is no compelling circumstance for this Court to issue direction to re-evaluate the answer-sheets.

5. This application has no merit and is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

Praveen-II/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	11.08.2017
Transmission Date	N/A

