

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 2254 of 2019**

- Rathod Krishna Veni D/o Rathod Mangu Lal Aged About 26 Years R/o House No. 2/5A6, Kathapally, Mandal Narnoor, District Adilabad (Telangana)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary Health And Family Welfare Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Registrar Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay Memorial Health Science And Ayush University, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Principal Chandu Lal Chandrakar Memorial, Medical College, Durg, District Durg Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Praveen Dhurandhar, Advocate

For Respondent/State : Shri Anand Verma, Dy. GA

For Respondent No.2 : Shri Ajay Kumar Dwivedi, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****08/07/2019**

1. Heard.
2. The present petition is filed seeking a direction against respondent No.2 to conduct the revaluation of the answer-sheet of the petitioner of the Medicine Paper-II, MBBS Final Part – II Examination.
3. Shri Ajay Kumar Dwivedi, learned counsel who is present in the Court, who appears for respondent No.2 is requested to appear and make submission.
4. It is contended that the petitioner has filed an application for revaluation of

answer book of subject Medicine (Part-II) Examination before respondent No.2 and has prayed for revaluation of the supplementary examination of Medicine (Part-II), so that she can rectify her defect. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that neither the petitioner is being provided with any information in that regard that whether any revaluation has been carried out or not? nor she is being supplied with answer-sheet under the RTI.

5. Shri Ajay Kumar Dwivedi, learned counsel for respondent No.2, on instructions, would submit that the petitioner can very well avail her answer book after payment of the requisite fees as required under the RTI. He would further submit that the revaluation as desired by the petitioner cannot be provided as per the Rule 10 (क) of the instructions related to the revaluation application form governing the revaluation of the petitioner.
6. It is not in dispute that the petitioner appeared in the supplementary examination of Medicine (Part-II) and the reading of the Rule 10 (क) of the instructions related to the revaluation application form would show that in case of 'supplementary examination', no revaluation can be done. In view of this, revaluation for the 'supplementary examination' cannot be ordered. Since, it has been stated, on instructions, that the respondents are ready and willing to give the answer-sheet of the petitioner on payment of requisite fee, the petitioner is directed to make deposit the fees with the respondent so that she may get the copy of the answer-sheet to improve or rectify her mistake.
7. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri
Judge