



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

122

LPA-2368-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: August 13, 2025

Jasmine

.....Appellant (s)

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. Ashish Gaur, Advocate and
Ms. Shivangi Sharma, Advocate
for the appellant(s).

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA J. (ORAL)

This appeal assails the order dated 30.07.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge, in CWP-20359-2025, whereby appellant's writ has been dismissed.

2. Grievance of the appellant is with regard to correctness of certain questions which has since been examined by the learned Single Judge by calling for relevant records and perusing the same. The writ Court has found no illegality or perversity in the answers so as to require any interference in exercise of writ jurisdiction.

3. Learned Single Judge has found that objections to the questions raised by the candidates were examined by the Subject Experts and based upon their recommendations, the final answer key has been published. Observations



made by the learned Single Judge, in that regard, are contained in para 2 and 3, of the judgment, which reads as under:-

“2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that answers to three questions of screening test, i.e., question no. 26, 44 and 46 of the Master Set were wrongly changed in the final answer key. Resultantly, the petitioner could not clear the test, though she correctly answered the questions as per the provisional answer key uploaded by the Commission. It is also contended that questions no. 17, 19, 20, 36, 52 and 76 of Master Set were wrongly deleted, and these had also been correctly answered by her as per the provisional answer key.

3. Pursuant to the last order, learned counsel for the Commission has produced subject experts’ report in a sealed cover, based upon which the final answer key to the test was uploaded by the Commission on 27.06.2025, as also the screening test result. The report has been perused, resealed and returned to the learned counsel. A perusal of the report shows that after considering the objections to the aforementioned questions, the subject experts advised change of answers or deletion of questions for varied reasons. The Commission accordingly prepared the final answer key as also the screening test result. There is no allegation of mala fide on the part of the Subject Experts, who are holding senior academic positions in Universities. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition in view of law settled in CWP-30309-2024 titled Amit and others v. State of Haryana and others.

4. Though various submissions are advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant with regard to correctness of the answer key but considering the limited scope of this Court in examining such issues, in light of the observations made by Hon’ble the Supreme Court in Para 31 and 32 of the judgment passed in **Ran Vijay and others Vs. State of U.P. and others, 2018(2)**



SCC 357, we are not persuaded to interfere in the matter. The observations made by Hon'ble the Supreme Court are reproduced as under:-

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 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.

(emphasis supplied by us)

5. Accordingly, the appeal is ***dismissed***.
6. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

August 13, 2025
sonia arora

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes / No
Whether reportable:	Yes / No