

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPURWrit Petition (C) No.3238 of 2017

Dirghesh Pratap Singh, S/o Shri Alakh Ram, aged about 23 years,
Occupation Student, R/o Village Umeshwarpur, P.S. & Tahsil
Premnagar, Civil & Revenue District Surajpur (C.G.)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department of Technical Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
2. Chhattisgarh Swami Vivekanand Technical University, Bhilai (C.G.), Through its Chancellor, Chhattisgarh Swami Vivekanand Technical University, Bhilai, District Durg (C.G.)
3. Registrar, Chhattisgarh Swami Vivekanand Technical University, Bhilai, District Durg (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner:	Mr. Sunil Sahu, Advocate.
For Respondent No.1/State:	Mr. Ashish Surana, Panel Lawyer.
For Respondents No.2 and 3:	Mr. Rajeev Shrivastava, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

05/12/2017

1. The petitioner herein has passed BE (Electrical and Electronics) from Chhattisgarh Swami Vivekanand Technical University, Bhilai securing 64.99% and graded second division. He made an application to the Vice Chancellor of the University that since he has secured 64.99%, therefore, it be made equivalent to 65% by rounding off by which he will be getting first division which has not been considered and decided.
2. In support of the rule of rounding off, Mr. Sahu, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, relied upon a decision of the Supreme Court in the matter of State of U.P. and another v. Pawan Kumar

Tiwari and others¹ in which the Supreme Court has considered the rule of rounding off and held that it is based on logic and common sense.

3. Be that as it may, the petitioner is at liberty to make additional representation to the Vice Chancellor of the respondent University who shall consider the case of the petitioner in light of the decision of the Supreme Court in **Pawan Kumar Tiwari's** case (supra) and decide the same within 30 days from the date of receipt of the additional representation.
4. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands finally disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

Soma

¹ (2005) 2 SCC 10