

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

Sr. No.206

CWP-13246-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision : 7.1.2020

Kavita

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Mukesh Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Munish Dadhwal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. K.K. Gupta, Advocate with

Mr. Vaibhav Gupta, Advocate, for respondents No.2 and 3.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner took admission in City College, Palri Panihara, District Mahendergarh in the year 2015 in the Diploma in Education (D.Ed.) course. She could not clear the first year of the said course and thus, had to repeat the same. In the examination held in January 2017, she failed once again and applied for re-evaluation, but no action was taken on the request for re-evaluation necessitating the filing of this writ petition.

In the writ petition, it has been averred that the first application for re-evaluation was made on 29.4.2017. This application was necessitated because online application could not be submitted as the computer system allegedly did not respond.

In the written statement filed on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3, it has been stated that requests for re-evaluation could only be accepted online and requests made otherwise were out-rightly rejected. The allegation that the online system was not functional has been denied by submitting that a large number of applications for re-evaluation were received online from other students. However, the specific allegation made in sub para-f of paragraph 2 of the writ petition has not been denied.

A replication has been filed on behalf of the petitioner, but the averment in the written statement that online requests for re-evaluation from other students were received in the office of respondents No.2 and 3 has not been controverted.

Thus, it is clear that the respondent-Board has followed an uniform procedure for re-evaluation of answer books. Re-evaluation was possible only if a request for the same was received online. The petitioner has admittedly not applied online and even if it is accepted that his representation dated 29.4.2017 was made within the prescribed period for re-evaluation, no benefit can be granted to her.

The writ petition is without any merit and is accordingly dismissed.

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

7.1.2020

Ramandeep Singh

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes/ No