



WP(MD)No.35127 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 11.12.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

WP(MD)No.35127 of 2025

and

WMP(MD)Nos.27841, 27844, 27845 of 2025

R.Aathi

... Petitioner

v.

Teachers Recruitment Board,
Rep. by its Chairman,
3rd & 4th Floor,
Puratchi Thalaivar
Dr.MGR Cenetenary Building,
Perasiriyar Anbazhagan Kalvi Valagam,
College Road,
Nungambakkam,
Chennai – 600 006.

... Respondent

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the constitution of India, seeking for the issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records pertaining to the impugned final answer key for History (published on 27.11.2025 by TRB) insofar as Question Nos.45 & 121 published and the



WP(MD)No.35127 of 2025

impugned result published by the respondent selecting the candidates for Certificate Verification for History subject dated 27.11.2025 for the Direct Recruitment of Post Graduate Assistant / Physical Director Grade - I / Computer Instructor Grade - I in School Education and other Departments in the Tamil Nadu Higher Secondary Educational Service - 2025 in Notification No.02/2025 dated 10.07.2025, quash the same and consequently, directing the respondent to revise the final answer key for History insofar as Question Nos.45 & 121 and to consider the candidature of the petitioner for the post of PG Assistant (History) in any one of the available vacancy on the basis of the final marks secured by him.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Cibi Chakraborty

For Respondent : Mr.Ajmal Khan,
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by
Mr.T.Amjad Khan,
Government Advocate

ORDER

The petitioner has applied for the post of PG (Assistant) in History pursuant to the notification issued by the respondent / Teachers



WP(MD)No.35127 of 2025

Recruitment Board dated 10.07.2025. He has filed this writ petition as against the impugned final answer key for History published by the respondent insofar as Question Nos.45 and 121 are concerned and also as against the selection list dated 27.11.2025 calling the candidates for certificate verification.

2.Learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has attended the written examination conducted on 12.10.2025 and thereafter, submitted objections with regards to Question Nos.45, 90, 100, 101 and 121 after the publication of the tentative answer key. However, the respondent has only considered the objections with regard to 2 questions and published the final answer key and the results calling the candidates for certificate verification were also published.

3.It is further submitted that the petitioner has obtained 93 marks as per the final answer key and has missed out on the cut-off marks of 94 due to non-consideration of his objections to the tentative answer key. Even though the petitioner has submitted objections based on reference to



standard text books for Question Nos.45 and 121, the same was not considered and hence, he has not been considered for the next stage of selection. Therefore, he prayed for appropriate orders.

4. On the other hand, the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondent Board submitted that the objections submitted by all the candidates were considered by an expert committee consisting of the subject experts and only on the basis of the report given by the expert committee, the final answer key was published on 27.11.2025 and the successful candidates were called for certificate verification. He further submitted that the expert committee has scrutinized the objections and the evidence submitted by the petitioner and determined that the correct answer to Question Nos.45 and 121 is Option (B). Since the petitioner has not cleared the cut-off marks of 94, the petitioner was not called for certificate verification. Hence, he prayed for dismissal.

5. This Court considered the rival submissions and perused the materials.



WEB COPY

6. The petitioner has appeared for the written examination for the post of Post Graduate Assistant in History conducted pursuant to the notification dated 10.07.2025 published by the respondent Board. After the tentative answer key was published, the petitioner has raised objections with regard to certain questions and thereafter the final answer key was published. The main grievance of the petitioner is that his objections that the correct answer to Question Nos.45 and 121 was Option (A) was not considered and instead the correct option has been indicated as Option (B) in the final answer key.

7. It is a settled position that the scope for High Courts to interfere in academic matters is limited and this Court cannot overrule the opinion of experts. It would be relevant to refer to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ran Vijay Singh v. State of UP* [(2018) 2 SCC 357], wherein it was held that Courts should not re-evaluate or scrutinize the answer keys of a candidate and the benefit of doubt should go to the examination authority. The relevant portions are extracted as under:



“30. The law on the subject is therefore, quite clear and we only propose to highlight a few significant conclusions. They are:

(i) 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;

(ii) If a statute, Rule or Regulation governing an examination does not permit re-evaluation or scrutiny of an answer sheet (as distinct from prohibiting it) 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;

(iii) The Court should not at all re-evaluate or scrutinize the answer sheets of a candidate – it has no expertise in the matter and academic matters are best left to academics;

(iv) The Court should presume the correctness of the key answers and proceed on that assumption; and

(v) In the event of a doubt, the benefit should go to the examination authority rather than to the candidate.”

8. In the present case, an opportunity has been provided to the petitioner to make objections to the tentative answer key and the same were



considered by an expert committee consisting of academic experts. The expert committee, after considering the objections and also the materials in support of the same, has determined that the correct answer to Question Nos.45 and 121 as Option (B) and the final answer key has been published on the basis of the same. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ran Vijay Singh's* case (supra), this Court cannot re-evaluate the answer keys, as it is not an expert in academic matters and the benefit should be given to the examination authority. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the final answer key which was published based on the report of the expert committee consisting of the subject experts.

9.In the result, this writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

11.12.2025

gk



WP(MD)No.35127 of 2025

WEB COPY

To
The Chairman,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
3rd & 4th Floor,
Puratchi Thalaivar
Dr.MGR Cenetenary Building,
Perasiriyar Anbazhagan Kalvi Valagam,
College Road,
Nungambakkam,
Chennai – 600 006.



WEB COPY



WP(MD)No.35127 of 2025

B.PUGALENDHI, J.

gk

WP(MD)No.35127 of 2025

11.12.2025