

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11626 of 2022

=====

Neha Kumari Daughter of Uttam Prasad Singh, Resident of Mohalla- Bypass
Road, Mahisouri, P.O., P.S. and Dist.- Jamui.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University through its Registrar, Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur.
 2. Registrar, Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur.
 3. Controller of Examination, Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur.
- Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Prabhat Ranjan Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Dr.Anand Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 11-09-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur
(hereinafter referred to as the ‘University’).

2. Petitioner in the present case is seeking a direction
to the respondents to correct the marksheet of B.Sc. Part III
Examination, 2020 of the petitioner. It is submitted that the
petitioner has secured 69 marks in Paper-VIII but in the
marksheet it has been wrongly shown as 45 marks.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
when the petitioner applied for a copy of the answer-sheet under
Right to Information Act, the Registrar-cum-First Appellate
Authority vide his Letter No. RTI/213/2021 dated 07.07.2021
made her available a photo copy of her answer-sheet of Paper-



VIII from which it appears that the petitioner has secured 69 marks.

4. It is further stated that the petitioner has submitted an application along with marksheet before the Examination Controller of the University through post on 25.08.2021 with a prayer to scrutinize the answer-sheet and to issue a corrected marksheet but till date her grievance has not been redressed.

5. Earlier the University vide its Letter No. RTI/348/2021 dated 04.12.2021 informed the petitioner that in the next meeting of the scrutiny committee her grievance will be considered and a decision will be taken.

6. The submission is that the petitioner who is a student having a bright career in future is suffering because of the casual approach of the authorities of the University.

7. Dr. Anand Kumar, learned counsel for the University submits that presently he has no instruction, however, the request of the petitioner for scrutiny should have been considered by now and an appropriate decision thereon was required to be taken by the University.

8. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the pleading available in the writ application and the documents enclosed in support of the submissions of the



petitioner, this Court is of the considered opinion that the authorities of the University, if they have not taken any decision till date in the scrutiny committee meeting, are definitely liable to be deprecated for their casual and lackadaisical approach.

9. The Vice Chancellor and Registrar of the University are directed to look into the grievance of the petitioner and take remedial measures to get corrected the marksheet of the petitioner, if so required and issue a fresh marksheet within a period of four weeks from today.

10. If the University has not taken any decision on the request of the petitioner and the matter has been kept pending so far compelling the petitioner to move this Court for redressal of her grievance, the University would also be liable to pay cost of litigation which is assessed as Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only). The same will be paid to the petitioner within the same period of four weeks.

11. This writ application is disposed of accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

tusharika/-

U			
---	--	--	--

