

WPA 22180 of 2024

Anik Chakraborty
Vs.
The University of Calcutta & Ors.

Ms. Debolina Chakraborty
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Nilotpal Chatterjee,
Mr. Satyaki Banerjee.
...for the CU.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a student of B.Com (Hons) in the Calcutta University. He has qualified in 5 out of 6 semesters for the course. However, in the 5th semester subject 'Corporate Accounting' he could not pass in the first attempt. He took a second attempt, but unfortunately he was again declared as failed. In respect of some of the questions, marks have been given like 1 out of 15. There is hardly any scope for giving such marks. An expert may be appointed to assess the answer script.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the University denies the allegations and submits as follows. There is no scope for a second review for an examination paper. The petitioner has already availed of the opportunity to have a review done for the paper. In fact, the marks was increased by one. However, he still falls short by about 4 more marks. It is settled law that there is no harm, even if zero marks is allotted for an answer if the answer is wrong.

It appears that the petitioner has already availed of the provision of review. In fact, there was an increase by one marks. But, that was not enough for him to pass the subject.

It does not appear that there is any particular bar in granting of marks like 1 or 2 out of 15 for any answer.

This in the domain of experts and there are competent persons who have not only examined the petitioner's papers once, but reviewed it once. Moreover, there is no scope of a second review.

Therefore, I do not find any merit in this application. Accordingly, the same is dismissed, however, without any order as to costs.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)