



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No. 3217 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24.11.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY**

Cont.P.No.3217 of 2025

P.M.Selvaraj

... Petitioner

Vs

1. Thiru.Alok.Ranjan, IPS,
The Director/Director General of Police,
National Crime Records Bureau,
National Highway – 8, Mahipalpur,
New Delhi – 110037.

2. Dr.Indira Sudha,
The Director/Superintendent of Police,
Central Finger Print Bureau,
National Highway – 8, Mahipalpur,
New Delhi – 110 037.

... Respondents

Prayer: Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 praying to punish the respondents for willfully disobeying the order passed by this Court in W.P.No. 23359 of 2023 dated 20.06.2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Anandaraj

For R1 & R2 : Mr.V.Chandrasekaran



Cont.P.No. 3217 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

The contempt petition has been filed complaining willful disobedience of the Order passed by this Court in W.P.No.23359 of 2023 dated 20.06.2024.

2. In the previous hearings, when it is reported by the respondents that they have carried out the revaluation and yet the petitioner did not score the minimum qualifying mark of 75, the same was not accepted by the petitioner. Under the circumstances, this Court also directed the production of the papers under the sealed cover.

3. Today, the papers are produced. It can be seen that the revaluation is done and the mark is given in pencil. In respect of one paper, three marks extra has been given that is as against the original total of 65. Now the petitioner is given 68 marks.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would still point out with reference to question No.4. When the petitioner has given the correct answer, the respondents are giving only the same 12 marks. The expert, who is present before the Court tried to justify the same, by stating that as per the key, 10 marks, 10 marks and 5 marks have to be given for the respective



Cont.P.No. 3217 of 2025

stages. With reference to the answer, since the steps are not mentioned, only half mark is given. With reference to circling, since he has not encircled in full and only circled in half, the mark is accordingly given.

5. In the contempt petition, the Court cannot decide one way or the other. In any event, when the revaluation is done and it is stated that the direction given earlier has been complied with, if the petitioner is aggrieved by the said exercise, it would be open for the petitioner to agitate the same in the manner known to law.

6. One thing this Court observed is that when there is provision for revaluation in the rules, the experts are marking the questions in ink near the questions and without masking the same, the paper is given for revaluation, which may lead to bias for the persons who are correcting the answer sheet for the second time. In these kind of exercises, either the mark should be entered in the index or if the marks are entered, care must be taken to take a photocopy by duly masking the marks that are given by the first valuer while giving the paper to the second valuer.



Cont.P.No. 3217 of 2025

7. *Mr.V.Chandrasekaran*, the learned counsel appearing for the respondents is requested to provide photocopy of the revalued answer scripts to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

8. With the above liberty kept open to be petitioner, the contempt petition stands closed. No costs.

24.11.2025

Neutral Citation: Yes/No
nsl



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No. 3217 of 2025

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

ns1

Cont.P.No.3217 of 2025

24.11.2025



Cont.P.No. 3217 of 2025

Cont.P.No.3217 of 2025

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY.J.,

WEB COPY

Today, the matter is listed under the caption ‘for being mentioned’.

2. In the order dated 24.11.2025, in the cause title, the respondents 3 to 5 who are deleted is not mentioned. Therefore, after the cause title, ie., after the name of the 2nd respondent, registry is directed to include the following lines and issue fresh order copy.

“Respondents 3 to 5 are deleted from the contempt petition as per the order of the Court made in Cont.P.No.3217 of 2025 dated 13.10.2025.”

15.12.2025

veda