

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19419 of 2024

=====

Rohan Kumar Son of Manoj Kumar Singh Resident of Mohalla- Race Course,
Chakkar Maidan, West of Prabhat Tara School, P.O.- Head Post Office, P.S.-
Kaji Mohammadpur, District/ Town- Muzaffarpur- 842001.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar Bihar University Muzaffarpur- 842001.
2. The Vice Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar Bihar University,
Muzaffarpur- 842001.
3. The Registrar, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar Bihar University,
Muzaffarpur- 842001.
4. The Controller of Examination, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar Bihar
University, Muzaffarpur- 842001.
5. The Public Information Officer, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar Bihar
University, Muzaffarpur- 842001.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Jeetendra Narayan
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Bindhyachal Rai
For the University	:	Mr. Vivekanand Singh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 21-04-2025

1. Heard the parties.

2. The Petitioner has filed the present writ application
for a direction to the respondent/university to re-evaluate/re-
examine the second paper of the answer sheet of Pre-PhD
Examination Test 2022, wherein the petitioner appeared on
09.06.2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
answer sheet of the petitioner has not been properly examined
by the examiner, which is evident from the answer sheet
procured by the petitioner under Right to Information Act, 2005.



The petitioner has secured total 40 marks in Pre-PhD examination, which according to the petitioner is less than the performance of the petitioner in the examination and the petitioner ought to have secured marks more than 50 in that paper. The answer sheet has been annexed as Annexure P/7 and referring to the same, learned counsel submits that the answer sheet does not bear the signature of the examiner.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the University submits that there is no provision under the regulation for re-evaluation of the answer sheet. The answer sheet was evaluated by the Competent Examiner.

5. After having heard learned counsel for the parties and from perusal of the answer sheet, it appears that the petitioner has been awarded marks on every question answered by him and the marks awarded by the examiner has been put on the left side of the answer in the answer sheet. The petitioner has failed to produce any regulation/provision of the University for re-evaluation of the answers. Mainly, on the speculative statement of the petitioner that he should have been given more than 50 marks and the answer sheet was not signed by the examiner is not enough for directing the University to re-evaluate the answer sheet.



6. In view of the aforesaid observation, I do not find any merit in the present writ application.

7. Accordingly, the present writ application stands dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

HarshPandey/-

U			
---	--	--	--

