



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

WP No. 41440 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 46399 OF 2025

S.Nithesh

S/o. Sekar,

No.1, Kasthuribai Street, V.O.C. Nagar,

Pammal, Chennai-600 009

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Principal Secretary To Government
Higher Education Department, Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009

2.The Secretary
Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission, TNPSC
Road, Park Town, Chennai.

3.The Controller Of Examinations
Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission, TNPSC
Road, Park Town, Chennai.

Respondent(s)



PRAYER Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India for the issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the Respondents to re-evaluate the petitioner's answer book I in respect of Paper II General Studies (Combined Civil Services Examination II-Group-II/Group-IIA, Services, Main Written Examination) and award appropriate marks and consequently, select and appoint him for any appropriate post and grant all consequential service and monetary benefits

WP No. 41440 of 2025

For Petitioner(s): Mr. G.Bharath Rajan

For Respondent: Mr.M.R.Gokulkrishnan,
Addl. Govt. Pleader for R1

Mr.R.Karthik Jagannath for R2 and R3

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking for a direction directing the respondents to re-evaluate the petitioner's answer book I in respect of Paper II General Studies (Combined Civil Services Examination-II-Group-IIA, Services, Main Written Examination) and award appropriate marks.

2. The petitioner was qualified with a B.B.A. (Bachelor of Business Administration) in the year 2020 and appeared for examination to the post of Group-II Services/Group-IIA services. He had secured overall marks 147.25. Thereafter, the petitioner was called for certificate verification, however, his candidature was rejected on the ground that the petitioner was not possessed the



education qualification as prescribed in the notification. Hence, a Writ Petition in W.P.No. 5112 of 2025 was filed and in the said Writ Petition, the respondents were directed to keep one post vacant for the petitioner and the Writ Petition is pending. Now, the petitioner filed this Writ Petition seeking for a direction directing the respondents to re-evaluate the answer book I in respect of Paper II General Studies and the petitioner filed in the Writ Petition in W.P.No.5112 of 2025, wherein the petitioner did not whisper about the qualification of paper. Further, the petitioner has applied for the post of Junior Cooperative Audit, for which it requires Bachelor of Business Management, but the petitioner is qualified with the degree of B.B.A. After having been applied in the selection to the post of Junior Cooperative Audit, now the petitioner filed this Writ Petition seeking for a direction to re-evaluate the answer paper for other posts under the same category.

3. On perusal of notification issued by the respondents, it does not provide for re-evaluation of answer book. Further, though re-evaluation can be directed if rules permit, this Court can deprecate the practice of re-evaluation and scrutiny of the questions by the courts, which lack expertise in academic matters. It is not permissible for this Court as claimed to examine the question papers and answer sheets itself, particularly, when the expert corrected the paper by considering the recommendation of the expert committee, who have the expertise the re-evaluation of answer sheet. If a statute, Rule or Regulation



governing an examination permits the re-evaluation of an answer sheet or scrutiny of an answer sheet, as a matter of right, then the authority conducting the examination may permit it. If a statute, Rule or Regulation governing an examination does not permit re-evaluation or scrutiny of an answer, then the court may permit re-evaluation or scrutiny only if it is demonstrated very clearly, without any inferential process of reasoning or by a process of rationalisation and only in rare or exceptional cases that a material error has been committed. The Court should not at all re-evaluate or scrutinise the answer sheets of a candidate, since it has no expertise in the matter and academic matters are best left to academics. Further, the Court should presume the correctness of the key answers and proceed on that assumption. In the event of a doubt, the benefit should go to the examination authority rather than to the candidate. Considering that if the law on subject emerges to the effect that in the absence of any provision or rule or regulation, this Court is not inclined to give any direction for the re-evaluation of answer sheet. In view of the above, the prayer sought by the petitioner in this Writ Petition cannot be granted.

4. In the result, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected Writ Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

06-11-2025



Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

rpp

To

1. The Principal Secretary To Government

Higher Education Department, Secretariat, Chennai-600 009

2. The Secretary

Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission, TNPSC Road, Park Town,
Chennai.

3. The Controller Of Examinations

Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission, TNPSC Road, Park Town,
Chennai.

4. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

WP No. 41440 of 2025



G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN J.

rpp

**WP No. 41440 of 2025
AND WMP NO. 46399
OF 2025**

06-11-2025