



WEB COPY

W.P.No.19434 of 2019



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.10.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE T.VINOD KUMAR

W.P.No.19434 of 2019

Praveen Kumar

.. Petitioner

vs

The Chairman,
Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission,
Chennai.

... Respondent

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to the impugned provisional selection list website of the respondent dated 03.04.2019 Combined Civil Services-I Examination (Group I Services), 2019 and quash the same, consequently direct the respondent herein to re-evaluate the petitioner's answer paper for Combined Civil Services-I Examination (Group I Services), 2019 conducted by the respondent by rectifying the wrong key answer and awarding marks for discrepancy questions in respect of the question No.47, 50, 60, 83, 85, 128, 143 and 184.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Neethidurai

For Respondent : Mr.I.Abrar Mohamed Abdullah
Standing Counsel



ORDER

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

2.The case of the petitioner in brief is that the provisional selected list of the respondent dated 03.04.2019 issued for selecting candidates for applying Combined Civil Services -I Examination (Group I Services), pursuant to the exam conducted by the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission, wrong answer key was given for some of questions, particularly in relation to question Nos. 47, 50, 60, 83, 85, 128, 143 and 184 and as such, the respondent ought to be directed to rectify the aforesaid wrong key answers in respect of the aforesaid questions and to revalidate the petitioner answer papers for Combined Civil Services -I Examination (Group I Services) examination by awarding marks in place of wrong key applied and if such correction is undertaken the petitioner would secure qualifying marks for being selected in the aforesaid examination.

3. Per contra, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent submits that the respondent conducted examination for Group-I Services on 03.03.2019; that on releasing the answer key on 03.04.2019



certain objections have been received; that the respondent considering the objections received, constituted an Expert Committee which had accepted some of the objections and decided to award marks.

4. Learned Standing Counsel further submits that on the Expert Committee taking the aforesaid decision not only for the petitioner, but for all the candidates answer sheets were evaluated on the basis of revised answer key as provided by the Expert Committee and based on the aforesaid key, the petitioner had secured 183 marks.

5. Learned Standing counsel further submitted that as per the instructions given to the candidates, the candidate is required to shade the Question Booklet number in the OMR answer sheet and in the event of incorrect shading/absence of shading of Question Booklet number in the OMR answer sheet, two(2) marks will be deducted as per the instructions No.6 of the instructions to Applicants and since, the petitioner though mentioned the Question Booklet number, did not shade the last digit, two marks were deducted from the overall total marks i.e., 183 secured by the petitioner. Thus, the petitioner's total marks secured is 181 marks.



WEB COPY

6. Learned Standing Counsel further submits that since, the petitioner falls under BC-General Category, the cut-off mark obtained in preliminary examination was fixed at 189 and inasmuch as, the petitioner after deducting two(2) marks for incorrect shading/absence of shading of Question Booklet number in the OMR answer sheet being reduced by two(2) marks, his overall aggregate marks being 181, the petitioner was not selected for the main examination.

7. Learned Standing Counsel for the respondent by stating as above has placed before this Court, the copy of the OMR answer sheet of the petitioner and the details of category wise the cut-off marks of the preliminary examination, for perusal of this Court and also the deficiency with regard to the incorrect shading/absence of shading of Question Booklet number in the OMR answer sheet.

8. A perusal of the OMR answer sheet as placed before this Court by the respondent shows that the petitioner having secured 183 marks for answering the question numbering to 200 which is evaluated at 1.5 marks per question aggregating to 300 marks. Further, a perusal of the OMR answer sheet of the petitioner shows absence of shading the last digit of the



Question Booklet number written by him in the OMR sheet, thereby, two(2) marks being deducted as per instruction No.6 from the total marks secured. Thus, the total marks secured by the petitioner is only 181 marks.

9. Further, a perusal of the details of cut-off mark in respect of BC general category, is 189. Since, the petitioner has secured overall marks of 181, and the said mark being much below the cut-off mark and having failed to secure the marks above the cut-off mark. The petitioner cannot claim of he not being called for main examination by the respondent. Since, the petitioner did not secure marks above the cut-off marks obtained by the last candidate, this Court is of the view that no case is made out for interfering in the selection process undertaken by the respondent.

10. In view of the above, the present writ petition is devoid of merits and is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

30.10.2025

Speaking order / Non-speaking order
Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
msv
To
The Chairman,
Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission,
Chennai.



WEB COPY

W.P.No.19434 of 2019



T. VINOD KUMAR, J.

msv

W.P.No.19434 of 2019

30.10.2025