

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 3270 of 2017**

- Nishant Singh S/o Shri Ravi Kant Singh Aged About 22 Years
Room Number 35 Hostel, Nagar Pt. Ravi Shankar University
Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

- Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla University Raipur Through Registrar,
Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla University, G. E. Road, Raipur
Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Petitioner
For Respondent

Mr. Anup Majumdar, Advocate
Mr. Neeraj Choubey, Advocate

Order On Board By**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra****24/10/2018**

1. Heard.
2. The petitioner is seeking re-evaluation of his answer sheets of LLB Part-IV Second Semester Examination.
3. Admittedly, the subject Regulation of the University does not provide for re-evaluation of the answer sheets of the said examination as stated in the Notesheet -Anenxure R/2.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that when the petitioner had moved an application for re-evaluation, he was called in the meeting of the Result Committee and the answer

sheets of the concerned subject were shown to him, wherein, he was shown to have secured 11 marks for question No.5 but the Tabulation Sheet- Annexure R/1 would allot only 5 marks for question No.5 and similarly, no mark is awarded for question No.4, which the petitioner had attempted.

5. The documents filed by the respondents, particularly the Note-sheet of the Result Committee- Annexure R/2, would demonstrate that the matter has been considered by the competent authority and upon due consideration, it has been found that the answer sheets have been evaluated properly and no case for re-evaluation or change of result of the said paper is called for.
6. In the matter of **Central Board of Secondary Education Through Secretary, All India Pre-Medical/Pre-Dental Entrance Examination and others Vs. Khushboo Shrivastava and others, (2014 14 SCC 523)**, the Supreme Court has held that when there is no provision for re-evaluation in the subject Regulation governing the Examinations, the writ Court is not entitled to direct re-evaluation.
7. In respect of the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner in relation to questions 4 & 5 also, the matters appears to have been examined by the competent authority and having seen the answer sheets, the Result Committee has found that the answer sheets have been evaluated properly.
8. Thus, it is not for the writ Court to sit over the decision taken by

the Result Committee as if it is an appeal against the order passed by the Result Committee.

9. Ordinarily, the decision taken by the Expert Bodies in Academic matters should be left to be decided by the concerned Expert Body and the Court should not venture to embark on an enquiry under the writ jurisdiction.

10. The writ petition deserves to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-

(Prashant Kumar Mishra)

Judge

Shyna