

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.4284 of 2018
Date of Decision: 22.02.2018

Anju Devi

. . . . Petitioner

Vs.

Central Board of Secondary Education and another

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: - HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: Mr.Inder Pal Goyat, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J.

The National Eligibility Test (NET) was held on 5.11.2017 to determine the eligibility for Assistant Professor only or Junior Research Fellowship & eligibility for Assistant Professor both in Indian Universities and Colleges. The petitioner appeared in the UGC NET examination in the subject of Hindi (Code 020) under Roll No.22007438. On 12.12.2017, the respondents uploaded the scanned images of OMR answer sheets of the candidates with their recorded responses and answer keys of UGC's National Eligibility Test (NET) Exam 2017. The opportunity was granted to the candidates to challenge the answer key between 12.12.2017 to 18.12.2017. The petitioner allegedly filed the objection after depositing the requisite fee in order to challenge question No.6 of Hindi Paper-II on the ground that the question itself was wrong. After the objection was filed, the final answer key was uploaded on 29.12.2017 and in the Hindi Paper-II the only correction was made that instead of option 3, both options 3 & 4 were declared to be correct options for question No.18. But insofar as question

No.6 is concerned, the same answer was maintained which was originally provided in the answer key. The petitioner has in fact secured 58.86% marks whereas the cut off for Hindi Paper-II in her category was 59.43% and therefore, she failed to qualify by 0.5% i.e. 2 marks. She has, therefore, challenged the answer of question No.6 of Hindi Paper-II alleging that the answer key is wrong. In support of his argument, learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to certain publications which are also attached with the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner in detail and after taking into consideration the facts and circumstances, much less the fact that the petitioner has already availed the remedy of filing objection to the correctness of the answer key and the respondents have maintained the answer which was originally provided in the answer key and that the petitioner has relied upon certain material which cannot be said to be such to override the material relied upon by the experts of the respondents, who had prepared the answer key of the question No.6, I do not find any reason to interfere in this petition and hence, the same is hereby dismissed.

22.02.2018

Vivek

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No