

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.18879 of 2018
Date of Decision:01.08.2018

Shiffali

..... Petitioner

Vs.

Punjab University and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: - Mr.Davinder Singh Khurana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner completed her B.Com. (Hons.) in the year 2017 as a student of Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce and Management, Ludhiana which is affiliated to the Panjab University, Chandigarh. She has allegedly completed her 5th semester (December 2016) in March 2017 after obtaining 511 marks out of 600 marks. She secured 66 marks out of 80 marks in the written examination of the subject of Income Tax Law in the 5th semester, the result of which was declared in March 2017. She applied for re-evaluation of the answer-sheet of the said subject but her result was not declared in September 2017 rather it was shown "RL" [Result Late] but it was later on declared in December 2017 and her marks were reduced from 66 to 62. It is averred in the petition that the petitioner had applied for re-evaluation because she had a reasonable doubt about the evaluation of answer-sheet by the examiner but to her utter surprise, instead of increasing her marks as expected, the marks have been decreased. The petitioner sought the guidance of her teachers Sarita Arora and Meenu Gupta, who are teaching in the same college, who have opined that the petitioner should

have been awarded 5 marks more. The petitioner has thus approached this Court with a prayer to issue a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the re-evaluation result declared in the month of December 2017 by which her marks were reduced from 66 to 62.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner, who has reiterated the stand taken by him in the petition that the re-evaluation has not been done by the respondents properly and solely relied upon the opinion expressed by the teachers of the college in which she was studying. It is also pertinent to mention that after completing her B.Com., she is now doing M.Com. from Panjab University. As a matter of fact, learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to raise any meaningful argument in this case because once the petitioner had taken the risk of re-evaluation and her answer-sheet was referred to an expert of the subject for the purpose of re-evaluation, there were chances of reduction of marks as well and the Court cannot rely upon the opinion expressed by the teachers of the petitioner's college in which the petitioner was studying earlier for the purpose of interference.

Thus, in view thereof, there is hardly any merit in this petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

01.08.2018

Vivek

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable : *Yes/No*