



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 47981 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 16.12.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P. No. 47981 of 2025

and

W.M.P. Nos. 53573 and 53574 of 2025

1. C.Senthilkumar

2. Dharani

...Petitioners

Vs.

1. The Director of School Education,
DPI Campus,
College Road,
Chennai 600006.

2. Teachers Recruitment Board,
Represented by its Member Secretary,
DPI Campus,
College Road,
Chennai 600 006.

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the 2nd Respondent Board with respect to the publication of the final key answer so far as the questions Nos.67, 85, 120, 136, 161, 43, 103, 52, 76, 101, 112, 130, 135, 145, 156, 155, 160, 161 and 162 and the consequential publication of the select list dated 27.11.2025 and quash the same so far as the non inclusion of the petitioner are concerned and consequently direct the Respondent Board to revise the key answers based on the Expert Committee constituted by the Court and



W.P. No. 47981 of 2025

accordingly revise and revalidate the answer sheet of the petitioners and appoint and select them to the post of PG Assistant Botany if the petitioners are come within the zone of consideration.

For Petitioners : Ms.Dakshayani Reddy, Senior Counsel
for M/s.S.Suneetha

For Respondents : Ms.Mythreye Chandru,
Special Government Pleader (for R1)

Mr.R.Neelakandan,
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by Mr.C.Kathiravan (for R2)

ORDER

The Writ Petition is filed for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the 2nd Respondent Board with respect to the publication of the final key answer so far as the question Nos.67, 85, 120, 136, 161, 43, 103, 52, 76, 101, 112, 130, 135, 145, 156, 155, 160, 161 and 162 and the consequential publication of the select list dated 27.11.2025 and quash the same so far as the non inclusion of the petitioner are concerned and consequently direct the Respondent Board to revise the key answers based on the Expert Committee constituted by the Court and accordingly revise and revalidate the answer sheet of the petitioners and appoint and select them to the post of PG Assistant Botany if the petitioners are come within the zone of consideration.



W.P. No. 47981 of 2025

WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the first respondent and the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the second respondent.

3. The case of the petitioners is that pursuant to the notification issued by the 2nd respondent to the post of Post Graduate Assistant in Tamil Nadu Higher Secondary Educational Service for the year 2025, the petitioners have applied for the post of PG Assistant (Botany) and appeared for written examination conducted on 12.10.2025. The petitioners were not satisfied with the tentative key answers in respect of Question Nos. 67, 85, 120, 136, 161, 43, 103, 52, 76, 101, 112, 130, 135, 145, 156, 155, 160, 161 and 162 and in the notification itself, the 2nd respondent has stated that any objections with regard to the Tentative answer key shall be raised through Online mode within the prescribed time. Accordingly, the petitioners raised objections with supporting documents through online mode. However, without considering their objections, the 2nd respondent published the final key answers and published the examination result on 27.11.2025, wherein the petitioners have secured 83 marks. However, the petitioners have not secured the cut off mark under their category. If the petitioners were awarded marks for the above said questions, they would have come within the zone of consideration and non awarding of marks, deprives



W.P. No. 47981 of 2025

their right to be considered for appointment to the post of PG Assistant.

Challenging the key final key answers and select list dated 27.11.2025 published by the 2nd respondent, the present Writ Petition is filed.

4.The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that it is settled law that if the key answer published by the 2nd respondent is probably wrong, this Court could exercise the power of judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to appoint an Expert Committee and after obtaining opinion from the expert, this Court may show that the tentative key answers published by the 2nd respondent in respect of certain questions are wrong and can award mark to the such questions to enable the petitioners to be selected to the above post. In support of her contention, the learned Senior Counsel replied upon the decision of the Apex Court in the case of ***Rishal and Others vs. Rajasthan Public Service Commission and Others*** reported in ***(2018) 8 SCC 81***.

5.Per contra, the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the 2nd respondent submitted that the notification itself provided for making objections with regard to the Tentative answer published by the 2nd respondent, through Online mode within the prescribed time. After receipt of the objections of the petitioners, the 2nd respondent has appointed Experts to evaluate the key



W.P. No. 47981 of 2025

answer given by the 2nd respondent as well as the answers attended by the petitioners. However, the experts opined that the key answer published by the 2nd respondent is correct.

6. On a perusal of the expert opinion, this Court is satisfied that the experts have opined that the answer key published by the 2nd respondent is perfectly in order.

7. The very same issue came up for consideration before the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Vikesh Kumar Gupta and others vs. The State of Rajasthan and others*** in ***Civil Appeal Nos. 3649 and 3650 of 2020***, wherein it has been categorically held that *“it is not permissible for the High Court to examine the question papers and answer sheets itself, particularly when the Commission has assessed the inter se merit of the candidates. The Courts have to show deference and consideration to the recommendation of the Expert Committee who have the expertise to evaluate and make recommendations.”*

8. For better appreciation, Paragraph No. 11 of the judgment (supra) reads as follows:

“11. Though re-evaluation can be directed if rules permit, this Court has deprecated the practice of re-evaluation and



WEB COPY

scrutiny of the questions by the courts which lack expertise in academic matters. It is not permissible for the High Court to examine the question papers and answer sheets itself, particularly when the Commission has assessed the inter se merit of the candidates (Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission v. Mukesh Thakur & Anr. MANU/SC/00401/2010 : (2010) 6 SCC 759) Courts have to show deference and consideration to the recommendation of the Expert Committee who have the expertise to evaluate and make recommendations [See- Basavaiah (Dr.) v. Dr. H.L. Ramesh & Ors. MANU/SC/0530/2010 : (2010) 8 SCC 372]. Examining the scope of judicial review with regards to re-evaluation of answer sheets, this Court in Ran Vijay Singh & Ors. v. State of Uttar Pradesh & Ors. MANU/SC/1578/2017 : (2018) 2 SCC 357 held that court should not re-evaluate or scrutinize the answer sheets of a candidate as it has no expertise in the matters and the academic matters are best left to academics. This Court in the said judgment further held as follows:

“31. On our part we may add that sympathy or compassion does not play any role in the matter of directing or not directing re-evaluation of an answer sheet. If an error is committed by the examination authority, the complete body of candidates suffers. The entire examination process does not deserve to be derailed only because some candidates are disappointed or dissatisfied or perceive some injustice having been caused to them by an erroneous question or an erroneous answer. All candidates suffer equally, though some might suffer more but that cannot be helped since mathematical precision is not always possible. This Court



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 47981 of 2025

has shown one way out of an impasse - exclude the suspect or offending question.

32. It is rather unfortunate that despite several decisions of this Court, some of which have been discussed above, there is interference by the courts in the result of examinations. This places the examination authorities in an unenviable position where they are under scrutiny and not the candidates. Additionally, a massive and sometimes prolonged examination exercise concludes with an air of uncertainty. While there is no doubt that candidates put in a tremendous effort in preparing for an examination, it must not be forgotten that even the examination authorities put in equally great efforts to successfully conduct an examination. The enormity of the task might reveal some lapse at a later stage, but the court must consider the internal checks and balances put in place by the examination authorities before interfering with the efforts put in by the candidates who have successfully participated in the examination and the examination authorities. The present appeals are a classic example of the consequence of such interference where there is no finality to the result of the examinations even after a lapse of eight years. Apart from the examination authorities even the candidates are left wondering about the certainty or otherwise of the result of the examination - whether they have passed or not; whether their result will be approved or disapproved by the court; whether they will get admission in a college or university or not; and whether they will get recruited or not.



This unsatisfactory situation does not work to anybody's advantage and such a state of uncertainty results in confusion being worse confounded. The overall and larger impact of all this is that public interest suffers."

9. In the present case, expert had already opined that the answer key published by the 2nd respondent is correct. Therefore, this Court cannot substitute the reasons for deferring the answers arrived at by experts. Hence, the prayer sought for in the present Writ Petition cannot be granted.

10. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

16.12.2025

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yest/No
Speaking or Non-speaking order
Maya

To

1. The Director of School Education,
DPI Campus,
College Road,
Chennai – 600 006.
2. The Member Secretary,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
DPI Campus,
College Road,



Chennai – 600 006.

WEB COPY



W.P. No. 47981 of 2025



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 47981 of 2025

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

Maya

W.P. No. 47981 of 2025

Dated : 16.12.2025