

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

CWP-19448-2022 (O&M)  
Date of decision:- 31.08.2022

Ajay

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar  
through its Registrar

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI**

Present: Mr. Paramjit Singh Jammu, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\* \* \* \*

**RAVI SHANKER JHA, C.J. (ORAL)**

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for a direction to the respondent-University to grant five additional marks to him for incorrect questions/answer key of booklet series 'C' with a further direction to consider his claim for admission to the B.Sc. (Hons.) Agriculture course for the session 2022-2023 after awarding five additional marks for the incorrect questions/answer key.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had appeared in the entrance examination seeking admission in the B.Sc. (Hons.) Agriculture course being run by the respondent-University. He further submits that questions No. 18, 26, 35, 69 and 91 in booklet series 'C' were answered correctly by the petitioner, but their answers were wrongly depicted in the answer key. He further submits that the petitioner in accordance with clause 5.7 of the prospectus filed objections in respect of the answer key showing answers to the aforesaid questions alongwith necessary fee of Rs. 100/- per question. He further submits that the answer key was published on 08.08.2022 and in terms of clause 5.7, the petitioner immediately filed objections on 09.08.2022. He further submits that thereafter the petitioner did not receive any communication and the final result was declared by the respondent-University on 17.08.2022. He further submits that in such circumstances, it be held by this Court that the answers given by the petitioner to the aforesaid questions are correct and that the answers provided by the respondents in the answer key are incorrect. He further submits that the petitioner is entitled to five additional marks one each for the aforesaid questions. He further submits that by adding five additional

marks to the total marks secured by the petitioner in the entrance examination, he may be granted admission in the B.Sc. (Hons.) Agriculture course. He further submits that the petitioner has placed the material on record to indicate that the answers given by the respondent-University in the answer key to questions No. 18, 26, 35, 69 and 91 contained in booklet series 'C' are not in accordance with the answers that have been published in the textbooks. He further submits that the respondents have not communicated any response to the objections and in such circumstances, the writ petition be allowed and the relief as prayed for be granted.

We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner at length.

Clause 5.7 of the prospectus reads as follows:-

***“5.7 Display of Answer Key***

*i. The University will display the answer key of the question paper at the University website to provide an opportunity to the candidates to check the answer key. The key will be displayed within 3 days of Entrance Test. If any candidate has any objection to the answer key he may submit it within two days of display of answer key with proper proof from text books.*

*ii. The candidates are required to pay of Rs. 100/- per question as processing charges in case he/she intends to challenge the key.*

*iii. The decision of the University on the challenges shall be final and the result will be declared on the basis of final answer keys.”*

From a perusal of the aforesaid clause, it is evident that a student who is aggrieved or has any objection in respect of the answer key that has been published by the respondent-University can file an objection within two days of such publication of the answer key alongwith a fee of Rs. 100/- per question in respect of which he has raised objection. The clause further provides that the respondent-University on the challenge(s) being raised by a student may take a decision in the matter which shall be final and in accordance therewith, the result would be declared.

In the instant case, it is evident that the respondent-University on the petitioner raising an objection considered the same and did not find any merit therein and thereafter declared the result on 17.08.2022. It is also evident that the petitioner did not at any point of time approach the respondent-University, thereafter, seeking either information in respect of the decision taken by them or raising any further objection, but directly filed the present writ petition. The law in respect of the Court's interference in such matters is already settled by the Supreme Court in *Rishal and others Vs Rajasthan Public*

*Service Commission and others* (2018) 8 SCC 81; *Uttar Pradesh Public Service Commission, through its Chairman and another Vs Rahul Singh and another* (2018) 7 SCC 254; *Ran Vijay Singh and others Vs State of Uttar Pradesh and others* (2018) 2 SCC 357 and *Vikesh Kumar Gupta and another Vs State of Rajasthan and others* (2021) 2 SCC 309, wherein it was clearly held that once an expert body has been constituted and has examined the correctness of the answer key as well as the efficacy of the objections raised by a student, the Court cannot sit over the decision of such an expert body to decide as to whether its decision is correct or not. In the present case, nothing has been placed before this Court to indicate that the respondent-University in terms of the instructions contained in the prospectus has not examined the matter and in fact as per clause 5.7 thereof, it is evident that the objections are required to be placed before the authorities to examine the answer(s) and announce the result which has been declared in accordance with law.

In view of the aforesaid, the writ petition stands dismissed.

**(RAVI SHANKER JHA)**  
**CHIEF JUSTICE**

**(ARUN PALLI)**  
**JUDGE**

**31.08.2022**  
Amodh Sharma

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |