

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**1008 WRIT PETITION NO. 2272 OF 2022**

VYANKAT MAROTIRAM GINGINE

VERSUS

SWAMI RAMANAND TEERTH MARAHWADA UNIVERSITY NANDED  
THROUGH REGISTRAR AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Mahesh V. Ghatge

Advocate for Respondent Nos. 1 to 4 : Mr. V. P. Latange

...

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND  
S. G. DIGE, JJ.**

**DATE : 25<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY, 2022**

**PER COURT :-**

1. Mr. Ghatge, learned counsel for petitioner submits that the petitioner appeared for PG Entrance Test (PET) of Library and Information Science Subject. The petitioner secured 44 marks. The qualifying marks required for registration are 45. The learned counsel further submits that error was noticed in question No. 35 of Section – B of the petitioner's subject.

2. The learned counsel for petitioner submits that as answer key itself was wrong, respondents allotted one additional mark. The learned counsel to substantiate this contention relies upon the additional mark granted to one Mr. Kesarkar M.P. For wrong question No. 35 of Section B, said Mr. Kesarkar M.P. was granted one additional mark by the respondent.

3. The petitioner also seeks parity.

4. Mr. Latange, learned counsel for respondents, on instructions of the respondents, accepts that answer key of question No. 35 was wrong and the candidates have been allotted additional one mark for the said wrong question. Probably application of the petitioner may not have been

received by the authorities.

5. Question No. 35 was as under :

Q. No. 35 : Arrange the following Library Legislations according to their year of enactment:

- (i) Goa Public Libraries Act.
- (ii) Maharashtra Public Libraries Act.
- (iii) It Manipur Public Libraries Act.
- (iv) West Bengal Public Libraries Act.

Answer Key was as under :

महाराष्ट्र 1967 प. बंगाल 1979 मणिपूर 1988 गुजरात 2002

6. Perusal of the question and answer key, it is manifest that 'Gujrath' is not mentioned in the question, however, answer key mentions "Gujrath" and does not mention "Goa". The sequence does not appear as per option given. It appears that because of the aforesaid, the respondents had decided to grant one additional mark to the candidates and the same were granted, as accepted by the respondents. The same additional mark is not granted to the petitioner.

7. In view of that, respondents may grant one additional mark to the petitioner for the subject of Library and Information Science in PET Examination, 2020.

8. Further consequences upon grant of additional mark shall follow. The authority shall take necessary steps accordingly.

9. The parties to act upon authenticated copy of this order.

10. Writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

( S.G. DIGE )  
JUDGE

( S.V. GANGAPURWALA )  
JUDGE