

\$~30

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% ***Date of decision: January 13, 2023***

+ **W.P.(C) 434/2023 & CM APPL. 1715/2023**

RAVINDER SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shivam Bedi and Ms. Gargi
Singh, Advocates with petitioner in
person

versus

REGISTRAR GENERAL HIGH COURT OF DELHI Respondent

Through: Mr. Gautam Narayan, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESH KUMAR KAIT

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Vide the present writ petition, the petitioner seeks quashing of the impugned letter dated 05.01.2023 issued by the respondent and directions to the respondent to re-evaluate the answer to Question No.9 of Law Paper-I of the petitioner by appointing an independent Examiner.
2. Learned counsel for the respondent, who is appearing on advance notice, submits that the answer to the question No.9 of Law Paper-I of the petitioner is wrong in the light of Section 134 (2) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 and the Examiner has rightly given him 'zero' marks for the answer in question.
3. However, without going into the merits of the present case and without commenting upon the decision taken by the Committee on the Administrative side, in the interest of justice, we hereby direct the respondent to send answer of question No.9 of Law Paper-I of petitioner

to any other Examiner to re-evaluate the said answer and on receipt of the assessment, the respondent shall take steps accordingly.

4. We hereby make it clear that, as agreed by the petitioner, the evaluation of the answer of question No.9 of Law Paper-I of petitioner by the Examiner shall be final and binding and the petitioner shall not agitate issue before this Court.

5. The petition is accordingly disposed of. Pending application also stands disposed of.

(SURESH KUMAR KAIT)
JUDGE

(NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA)
JUDGE

JANUARY 13, 2023/rk

