



WEB COPY



W.P.No.32974 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Orders Reserved on : 12..09..2023

Orders Pronounced on : 09..10..2023

Coram

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

Writ Petition No.32974 of 2022

and

W.M.P.No.32373 of 2022

T.R.Arthi

..... Petitioner

-Versus-

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by The Principal Secretary to Government,
School Education Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.

2.The Commissioner,
Directorate of School Education,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Chennai 600 006.

3.The Chairman,
Teacher Recruitment Board,
4th Floor, EVK Sampath Maaligai,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Chennai 600 006.

..... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to pass orders on the representation submitted by the petitioner dated 15.04.2022 for awarding three



W.P.No.32974 of 2022

marks for the petitioner in respect of English subject based on the proof produced from standard Textbooks and consequently directing the respondents to select and appoint the petitioner (21PG0204160027) to the post of P.G. Assistant (English) under MBC category, based on merits in the selection within a time frame to be fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : *Mr.G.Sankaran,*
Senior Counsel
for Mr.S.Nedunchezhiyan

For Respondent (s) : *Mr.P.Baladhandayutham,*
Special Government Pleader
for RR1 & 2
Mr.R.Neelakandan,
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by Mr.C.Kathiravan,
Standing Counsel for R3

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed seeking a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to pass orders on the representation submitted by the petitioner dated 15.04.2022 for awarding three marks for the petitioner in respect of English subject based on the proof produced from standard Textbooks and consequently directing the respondents to select and appoint the petitioner (21PG0204160027) to the post of P.G. Assistant (English) under MBC category, based on merits in the selection within a time frame to be fixed by this Court.

2. The petitioner is an aspirant for the post of Post Graduate Assistant



W.P.No.32974 of 2022

(English). She belongs to Most Backward Class (MBC) community. She is fully

qualified to apply for the post and he applied for the post pursuant to the Notification / Advertisement No.01/2021 dated 09.09.2021 issued by the 3rd respondent for direct recruitment to the post of Post Graduate Assistants / Physical Education Directors Grade-I/Computer Instructor Grade-I in School Education Department and other Departments for the year 2020-2021. There is no dispute in it. There is also no dispute regarding the Scheme of Examination. Her register/roll number is 21PG0204160027. She had taken the written examination on 18.02.2022 and secured 97.062311 out of 150 marks. The grievance of the petitioner is that the answers which she had given to Question Nos.57, 136 & 138 are correct and if she had been given marks for those questions, she would have reached the cut-off mark and thus, she would have been called for certificate verification and selected for appointment.

3. Since the petitioner failed to secure the cut-off marks pertaining to MBC category, she was not selected. It is the stand of the petitioner that key answers set in respect of Question Nos.57, 136 & 138 are demonstrably and palpably wrong and that therefore, he should have been awarded marks for those questions also.

4. The respondent board filed its counter affidavit denying the allegations



W.P.No.32974 of 2022

made in the writ petition and inter alia contending that objections were received from the candidates in respect of certain questions that key answers were wrong and an expert body was constituted and based on the opinion of the expert body certain key answers were revised and marks were given to the candidates. Therefore, now, it is not open to the petitioner to raise the same objection before this court as second round.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner took this court through the materials submitted during the course of argument in the form of typed set of papers in support of his submission that the answers opted by the petitioner are correct and the key answers are wrong and the petitioner is entitled to get marks for Question Nos.57, 136 & 138.

6. Per contra, the learned Additional Advocate General appearing on behalf of the learned standing counsel on record for the TRB taking this court through the counter affidavit submitted that questions setters were experts in their respective fields and the objections were referred to a expert body, who were also experts in the field. The expert body after examining the objections submitted its report that answers to certain questions were wrong. When there was an effective mechanism evolved by the TRB to raise objection to key answer, if any, and the objections raised by the candidates were already



W.P.No.32974 of 2022

considered by the expert body, the petitioner cannot raise the same claim once again before this court. Further, according to him, the books relied on by the petitioner to prove the errors were not the materials authorised by the State.

7. This court had called upon the TRB to produce the experts opinion justifying the key answers. Report of the expert committee was accordingly produced.

8. This court has considered the rival submissions carefully and gone through the materials on record including the report of the expert body.

9. In the case of **Kanpur University v. Samir Gupta** [(1983) 4 SCC 309], the Supreme Court has held that it should be presumed that the key answers set by the paper setters are correct, unless it is demonstrably wrong.

10. It is also the settled law that this court cannot conduct itself like an expert and go into the correctness of the key answers set to the questions by the paper setters and affirmed or revised by the expert body based certain concrete materials.

11. In **Ran Vijay Singh v. State of U.P.** [(2018) 2 SCC 357], the Supreme Court has held as under:-

“**30.1.** If a statute, Rule or Regulation governing an examination permits the re-evaluation of an answer sheet or scrutiny of an answer sheet as a matter of



W.P.No.32974 of 2022

right, then the authority conducting the examination may permit it;

30.2. If a statute, Rule or Regulation governing an examination does not permit re-evaluation or scrutiny of an answer sheet (as distinct from prohibiting it) then the court may permit re-evaluation or scrutiny only if it is demonstrated very clearly, without any “inferential process of reasoning or by a process of rationalisation” and only in rare or exceptional cases that a material error has been committed;

30.3. The court should not at all re-evaluate or scrutinise the answer sheets of a candidate—it has no expertise in the matter and academic matters are best left to academics;

30.4. The court should presume the correctness of the key answers and proceed on that assumption; and

30.5. In the event of a doubt, the benefit should go to the examination authority rather than to the candidate.”

12. In the case of *U.P. Public Service Commission v. Rahul Singh*, [(2018) 7 SCC 254], while reiterating the law on the subject, the Supreme Court the has held as under:-

12. The law is well settled that the onus is on



WEB COPY



W.P.No.32974 of 2022

the candidate to not only demonstrate that the key answer is incorrect but also that it is a glaring mistake which is totally apparent and no inferential process or reasoning is required to show that the key answer is wrong. The constitutional courts must exercise great restraint in such matters and should be reluctant to entertain a plea challenging the correctness of the key answers. In *Kanpur University case* [*Kanpur University v. Samir Gupta*, (1983) 4 SCC 309] , the Court recommended a system of:

- (1) moderation;
- (2) avoiding ambiguity in the questions;
- (3) prompt decisions be taken to exclude suspected questions and no marks be assigned to such questions.”

.....

14. In the present case, we find that all the three questions needed a long process of reasoning and the High Court itself has noticed that the stand of the Commission is also supported by certain textbooks. When there are conflicting views, then the court must bow down to the opinion of the experts. Judges are not and cannot be experts in all fields and, therefore, they must exercise great restraint and should not overstep their jurisdiction to upset the opinion of the experts.”

13. In the case of **High Court of Tripura v. Tirtha Sarthi Mukherjee**



W.P.No.32974 of 2022

and others [(2019) 2 Scale 708], the Supreme Court has held as under:-

WEB COPY

"19. The question however arises whether even if there is no legal right to demand revaluation as of right could there arise circumstances which leaves the Court in any doubt at all. A grave injustice may be occasioned to a writ applicant in certain circumstances. The case may arise where even though there is no provision for revaluation it turns out that despite giving the correct answer no marks are awarded. No doubt this must be confined to a case where there is no dispute about the correctness of the answer. Further, if there is any doubt, the doubt should be resolved in favour of the examining body rather than in favour of the candidate. The wide power under Article 226 may continue to be available even though there is no provision for revaluation in a situation where a candidate despite having given correct answer and about which there cannot be even slightest manner of doubt, he is treated as having given the wrong answer and consequently the candidate is found disentitled to any mark."

14. Very recently in the case of **Vikesh Kumar Gupta v. State of Rajasthan [(2021) 2 SCC 309]**, after considering a catena of decisions on the scope of judicial review with regard to reevaluation of the answer sheets, the



W.P.No.32974 of 2022

Supreme Court observed and held that the court should not re-evaluate or scrutinise the answer sheets of a candidate as it had no expertise in the matter and the academic matters are best left to academics.

15. The candidates who took the written examination were given an opportunity to submit their objections, if any, to the tentative key answers published by the TRB through online objection tracker. Based on the objections received from the candidates, an expert body was constituted to go into the correctness of the key answers. According to the TRB, valuation of the answer sheets was done by them based on the opinion of the expert body.

16. Though the petitioner claimed that the answer for Question No.57 published in the tentative key was wrong and option “C” is the correct one, it is to be noted that she did not even submit her objection to this question. It was, however, submitted by the learned Additional Advocate General that on considering the objections received from various other candidates, answer to the Question No.57 was deleted from valuation. Therefore, challenge to this question is rejected.

17. Insofar as Question Nos.136 & 138 are concerned, admittedly, the petitioner did not raise objection for these questions also at the relevant point of time despite there was an online mechanism for the same.



W.P.No.32974 of 2022

18. This court is not an expert in the academic matter. The scope of the judicial review against the experts' opinion is extremely limited and unless it is shown that the mistake is a glaring mistake which is totally apparent, the view of the examining body cannot be interfered with. Taking into account the guiding principles on the power of judicial review, this court does not want to assume the role of an academic expert. The emphasis in the case of Rahul Singh was that not only the onus is on the candidates to demonstrate that the key answer was incorrect, but also that it is a glaring mistake which is totally apparent and no inferential process of reasoning is required to show that the key answer was wrong. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner made an attempt to establish that the answers opted by the petitioner to the said questions are correct, he has not demonstrated before this court even to prima facie conclude that key answers in the final key to the disputed questions were palpably wrong.

19. This court do not want to assume the role of an expert and go into the correctness of the key answer which had already been gone into and affirmed by the expert committee based on certain concrete materials and revisit the same in exercise of its powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India and arrive at its own conclusion to substitute the opinion of the expert. She has



W.P.No.32974 of 2022

approached this court only on 24.11.2022 belatedly though final key and the results were published as early as on 04.07.2022. Having missed the bus, it is too late for the petitioner to raise objections to the key answers before this court. The petitioner is guilty of laches.

20. In view of the above settled legal position and the facts and circumstances of the case, this court does not find any merit in the writ petition and the same deserves only to be dismissed.

In the result, this writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected WMPs are closed.

09..10..2023

Index : yes / no
Neutral Citation : yes / no
Speaking / Non Speaking Order
kmk

To

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government, School Education Department, Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner, Directorate of School Education, DPI Campus, College Road, Chennai 600 006.
- 3.The Chairman, Teacher Recruitment Board, 4th Floor, EVK Sampath Maaligai,DPI Campus, College Road, Chennai 600 006.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.32974 of 2022

N.SATHISH KUMAR.J.,

kmk

Pre delivery Order
in
W.P.No.32974 of 2022

09..10..2023