



\$~132

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% *Judgment Delivered on:09.09.2025*

+ W.P.(C) 11654/2025 and CM 53502/2025

SAHIL PALIWAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Satayam Singh, Ms. Neema, Mr. Neeraj Kumar Singh and Ms. Vipasha Jain, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Khanna, Standing Counsel with Ms. Pragya Bhushan, Mr. Tarandeep Singh, Ms. Vilakshana Dayma and Ms. Mukta Singh, Advocates for R2/NTA.

Mr. T. Singhdev, Mr. Tanishq Srivastava and Mr. Vedant Sood, Advocates for R4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

JUDGMENT

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by petitioner seeking following reliefs:

“a) Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus, or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing the Respondent No. 2 to rectify and restore the correct result status and credentials of the Petitioner/ Sahil Paliwal bearing Roll No. 3907205568 and Application No. 250411670670 on the NEET UG 2025 portal maintained by Respondent No. 2 and 3; and/or

b) Direct the Respondent No. 2 and 3 to permit the Petitioner to register and participate in the ongoing NEET UG 2025 counselling process for admission in MBBS course as per his merit and



eligibility; and/or

c) Direct the Respondents to ensure that no prejudice is caused to the Petitioner due to the technical error/ mismanagement of roll number mapping or data integrity during the examination and counselling stages; and/or

d) Direct the Respondents to provisionally allow the Petitioner to complete registration, choice filing and participate in Round-1 of NEET UG 2025 MBBS counselling as per the extended schedule notified by Respondent no. 3; and/or

e) Direct the Respondents to reserve one MBBS seat for SC Category under the All India quota for the Petitioner, till the pendency of this petition, to avoid irreparable loss to the Petitioner; and/or

f) Direct the Respondents no. 2 and 3 to ensure that the Petitioner is not deprived of his legitimate seat in the counselling process, subject to merit and eligibility”

2. The case set out by petitioner in the present petition is that he appeared in NEET UG-2025 Examination having Application No. 250411670670 and Roll No. 3907205568 at Centre No. 3907205 - Govt. Raj Rishi College, Near Nehru Garden, Alwar-301001.

3. The petitioner being a meritorious student had obtained 612 marks, 95.4130516 percentile, All India Rank 510 and SC Category Rank as 104 as per the score card annexed as Annexure P-5 to the present petition.

4. It is stated that despite fulfilling all eligibility requirements, the petitioner was arbitrarily and illegally excluded from NEET UG-2025 counselling process conducted by respondent no.3/MCC. Elaborating further, it is alleged that when the petitioner logged into the portal using his alleged credentials i.e. Roll No. 3907205568, it showed the data of some other candidate. It is thus, alleged that the data of some other candidate had been mapped under the petitioner's Roll No. 3907205568.



5. It is further stated that petitioner escalated the matter through mail dated 31.07.2025 to respondent no.2/NTA and respondent no.3/MCC for serious error or technical mix up.
6. In the aforesaid backdrop, Mr. Satayam Singh, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that necessary directions be given for rectifying and restoring result status and credentials of the petitioner, bearing Roll No. 3907205568 and Application No. 250411670670 on the NEET UG-2025 Portal. He further urges that petitioner be permitted to register and participate in the ongoing NEET UG-2025 counselling process as per his merit and eligibility.
7. Notice was issued in the present petition. The respondent no. 2/NTA has filed its counter-affidavit *inter alia* taking a stand that documents alleged to have been generated and issued by respondent/NTA, and annexed with the present petition, are forged, fabricated, manipulated and doctored documents.
8. It has been elaborated that documents, particularly, (i) Confirmation Page bearing Application No. 250411670670 (Annexure P-3); (ii) Admit Card (Annexure P-4), bearing Roll No. 3907205568 and Application No. 250411670670 and (iii) Score Card (Annexure P-5) having same Roll number and application number, and showing 612 marks out of 700 in NEET UG-2025, do not correspond to the record of answering respondent/NTA.
9. It is further stated that Application Number and Roll Number of candidates registering for NEET UG-2025 are unique to each candidate and are generated automatically without any human interference.
10. As per the record of NTA, the petitioner's Application No. is



2025:DHC:8380



250411340690 and his Roll No. is 3907205463. The Application No. 250411670670 and Roll No. 3907205568 as mentioned on the documents relied upon by petitioner has been allotted to different candidates of NEET UG-2025, as per following details given in the tabulated chart:

	Petitioner	Candidate I	Candidate 2
Name of the Candidate	Sahil Paliwal	Durgam Amulya	Punit Sharma
Application Number	250411340690	250411670670 (claimed by the petitioner)	250410212321
Roll Number	3907205463	4210101018	3907205568 (claimed by the petitioner)
Question Booklet Code	47	46	48
State in which the exam was taken	Rajasthan (Alwar)	Telangana (District: Kumram Bheem)	Rajasthan (Alwar)
Category	SC	SC	GEN-EWS
Marks obtained	52	138	500
Percentile	14.4130516	48.4407625	97.6149190
All-India Rank	1889618	1133829	51985
Category Rank (SC)	262989	141466	6392

11. Mr. Sanjay Khanna, learned Standing Counsel for the NTA invites attention of the Court to Annexure R2/3, which is an attendance sheet signed by the petitioner, to contend that on the said attendance sheet, the pre-printed details of the petitioner viz., Application No. 250411340690 and Roll No. 3907205463 are present, which do not match with the Application



number and Roll number claimed by the petitioner to be his genuine credentials in Annexure P-4.

12. He submits that in the attendance sheet, the petitioner has also filled with his own hand, his test booklet number 125263263 and its Code No. 47. Further, it is contended that this test booklet number is the same as the OMR Answer Sheet number, both of which tally with the NTA records.

13. He submits that the petitioner himself, after verifying his pre-printed Roll number and Application number has signed the said attendance sheet at the time of commencement of the exam and thereafter again at the time of its conclusion. It is further submitted that the said attendance sheet also bears the thumb impression of the petitioner, as well as, the signatures of two invigilators, who were present during the course of the examination and cross-checked the details.

14. He further submits that one attendance sheet is used by three candidates and the photographs of all three candidates has also been affixed on the attendance sheet, including that of the petitioner.

15. He further submits that the OMR answer sheet which has been placed on record by the NTA along with counter-affidavit, has not been disputed by the petitioner, inasmuch as no rejoinder has been filed in the present petition. He submits that the said OMR sheet shows that petitioner has attempted 138 questions with 38 correct answers and 100 incorrect answers, accordingly, the petitioner has scored 52 marks out of 720.

16. He further invites attention of the court, to the QR Code on the alleged score card of the petitioner annexed to the present petition, to contend that upon scanning, it opens the page of *Kalpataru* on the website of Maharashtra RERA Department, which prima facie shows that the score



card alleged to have been issued by respondent/NTA, showing petitioner's marks as 612, is false, fabricated and tampered document.

17. He also draws attention of the Court to the Test Booklet filed by the petitioner pursuant to the directions given by the Court, to contend that petitioner has deliberately masked his name as well as Roll number, both in figures and words, written in his own handwriting at the time of exam, but incidentally petitioner has not masked the pre-printed Text Booklet number 6125263263 which matches with the number that petitioner filled in his own handwriting on the attendance sheet.

18. He further contends that marks and rank on the score card on which reliance has been placed by petitioner are not matching. Elaborating on his submission, he submits that as per 612 marks claimed by petitioner in the score card on which reliance has been placed, All-India Rank of petitioner is coming up 510 whereas as per the official record of NTA, candidate with the similar marks would have got All-India Rank between 710 to 740.

19. In rejoinder, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that petitioner is disputing the attendance sheet as well as the OMR sheet, which has been placed on record by the NTA, and the same does not pertain to the petitioner. He also denies petitioner's signatures, on both the said documents. He submits that facts of the present case warrants investigation and the petitioner is ready to co-operate in such investigation.

20. I have heard Mr. Satayam Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as, Mr. Sanjay Khanna, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent no.2/NTA and have perused the record.

21. It is the case of the petitioner that when he applied for NEET (UG) 2025 Examination, the application number which was generated upon



registration was 250411670670 (Annexure P-3). Further, admit card was issued by the Respondent No. 2/NTA to the petitioner, and the same shows his roll number as 3907205568 (Annexure P-4). It is further the case of the petitioner that he appeared in the NEET (UG) 2025 and obtained 612 marks, 95.4130516 percentile, All India Rank 510 and SC Category Rank 104 as per the score card (Annexure P-5).

22. It is also alleged that when the petitioner attempted to register for counselling with the aforesaid roll number 3907205568, the system showed the data of another candidate. He was, therefore, unable to register for the counselling process of NEET (UG) 2025 and was resultantly excluded.

23. On the other hand, the stand taken by respondent no. 2/NTA is that the documents relied upon by the petitioner are forged and fabricated. In fact, according to the petitioner's OMR sheet, which has been placed on record with the counter-affidavit, the petitioner attempted 138 questions, resulting in 38 correct and 100 incorrect answers. The score card (Annexure R2/5) of the petitioner thus, placed on record by the respondent no.2/NTA shows that the petitioner has scored only 52 marks out of 720.

24. A perusal of the both the score cards – one filed by the petitioner along with the writ petition, as well as, the other placed by the respondent no.2/NTA along with its counter-affidavit, shows that both bear the QR Codes.

25. Notably, the purpose behind making a document “QR-code-verifiable” is to verify the authenticity of contents of such document and to ascertain whether contents on the document are as per the official record or not.

26. In response to a specific query posed by the Court regarding the QR



Code on the scorecard filed with the petition, Mr. Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, fairly concedes that the scanning of said QR Code leads to the “*Project Details: Kalpataru Radiance A*”, a page on the official Maharashtra RERA Department website. On the other hand, scanning of QR Code on the scorecard filed by respondent no. 2/NTA directs to the petitioner's scorecard (Annexure R-5), which according to the NTA is the genuine scorecard. Thus, this Court finds that the scorecard as placed on record by the petitioner, has failed the QR-code-validity test.¹

27. This Court *vide* order dated 11.08.2025 had also directed the petitioner, to place on record his question paper (test booklet), the original admit card, as well as, emails which have been received by the petitioner from the respondent no.2/NTA, along with his affidavit.

28. In deference to this direction, the petitioner has filed an affidavit along with Admit Card-Provisional, test booklet, as well as, a copy of the email dated 14.06.2025 allegedly received by the petitioner from the respondent no.2 forwarding the score card on which the petitioner has placed reliance.

29. Intriguingly, the score card which forms part of the email dated 14.06.2025 does not have any QR Code and it does not resemble the usual format of scorecards which are uploaded by the respondent no.2/NTA.

30. Further, the test booklet which has been filed by the petitioner shows that the petitioner has masked his name as well as his roll number which a candidate is expected to write both in figures & in words on the said booklet by scratching off the same with pen. The first page of the test booklet is

¹Shantanu Bhopale Vs Union of India through the department of Higher Education [Writ Petition No. 3649 OF 2025; decided on 02.05.2025]



2025:DHC:8380



reproduced herein below for ready reference:

**TEST BOOKLET AS PLACED ON RECORD BY THE PETITIONER
(ANNEXURE B)**

76
63

17

X X X

Test Booklet Code
47

ARMADAN

HINDI-ENGLISH

आवश्यक निर्देश:

- उपरोक्त पत्र इस परीक्षा पुस्तिका के अन्तर्गत आता है। यह आवक परीक्षा पुस्तिका खोलने को कहा जाए, तो इस परीक्षा पुस्तिका पर आवश्यक नुस्खा प्रक्रियाओं पर ध्यान देकर सही ढंग से लिखना है।
- परीक्षा की अवधि 3 घंटे है, इस परीक्षा पुस्तिका में भौतिकी, रसायनशास्त्र एवं जीवविज्ञान (फिजिक्स, केमिस्ट्री एवं बायोलॉजी) विषयों के 180 बहुविकल्पीय प्रश्न हैं (4 विकल्पों में से एक सही उत्तर है)।
- जहाँ कहीं भी प्रश्नों/विकल्पों का उल्लेख नहीं किया गया हो, उन्हें उनके सामान्य अर्थ/प्रयोग के अनुसार सही माना जाएगा।
- प्रत्येक प्रश्न 4 अंक का है। प्रत्येक सही उत्तर के लिए परीक्षार्थी को 4 अंक दिए जाएंगे। प्रत्येक गलत उत्तर के लिए कुल योग में से एक अंक घटाया जाएगा। अधिकतम अंक 720 हैं।
- इस दस्तावेज़ पर विचारण अधिकार करने पर उत्तर पत्र पर निम्नलिखित के लिए केवल सही/गलत सही/गलत के प्रयोग करें।
- यह कार्य इस परीक्षा पुस्तिका में निर्धारित स्थान पर ही करें।
- परीक्षा समाप्त होने पर, परीक्षार्थी को इस दस्तावेज़ में पूर्ण रूप से (मूल प्रश्नों/विकल्पों एवं उत्तरों/विकल्पों) को परीक्षा की अवधि के अंत में परीक्षार्थी अपने साथ इस पुस्तिका ले जा सकते हैं।
- इस पुस्तिका का कोड "47" है। OMR उत्तर पत्र में इस पुस्तिका के कोड को सही ढंग से भरना आवश्यक है।

Important Instructions:

- The Answer Sheet is inside this Test Booklet. When you are directed to open the Test Booklet, take out the Answer Sheet and fill in the particulars on ORIGINAL Copy carefully with blue/black ball point pen only.
- The test is of 3 hours duration and the Test Booklet contains 180 multiple-choice questions (four options with a single correct answer) from Physics, Chemistry and Biology (Botany and Zoology).
- Wherever the symbols/constants are not mentioned, they are to be considered as per their standard meaning/value.
- Each question carries 4 marks. For each correct response, the candidate will get 4 marks. For each incorrect response, one mark will be deducted from the total score. The maximum marks are 720.
- Use Blue/Black Ball Point Pen only for writing particulars on this page/mark responses on Answer Sheet.
- Rough work is to be done in the space provided for this purpose in the Test Booklet only.
- On completion of the test, the candidate must hand over the Answer Sheet (ORIGINAL and OFFICE Copy) to the Investigator before leaving the Room/ Hall. The candidate is allowed to take away this Test Booklet with them.
- The CODE for this Booklet is "47". Make sure to enter this code in the OMR answer sheet.

अगर किसी प्रश्न में किसी अवस्था की स्थिति में, अंग्रेजी संस्करण को ही अंतिम माना जाएगा।
In case of any ambiguity in translation of any question, English version shall be treated as final.

परीक्षार्थी का नाम (सही अक्षरों में): राजेश कुमार

Name of the Candidate (in Capital):

रोल नंबर: 125263263

Roll Number

परीक्षा केंद्र (सही अक्षरों में): राजेश कुमार महाविद्यालय, अमर

Centre of Examination (in Capital):

परीक्षार्थी की हस्ताक्षर: Sahil

Candidate's Signature:

केंद्र प्रमुख की प्रमाणित हस्ताक्षर: प्रमाणित

Facsimile signature stamp of Centre Superintendent:

47_Hindi-English | राजेश कुमार महाविद्यालय, अमर | Contd.

31. Incidentally, the test booklet number is still visible on the above quoted first page of said document, which is 125263263. Thus, test booklet



number tallies with the test booklet number filled by the petitioner with his own writing on the pre-printed, attendance sheet (Annexure R2/3). The petitioner in his affidavit filed pursuant to the directions in order dated 11.08.2025, has not furnished any justification for masking his name, as well as, roll number on the test booklet. The roll number on the text booklet, if not masked, would have resolved the conundrum either way. Thus, such an act of petitioner *prima facie* shows *mala fide* intent on his part to destroy the best evidence and mislead the Court.

32. A perusal of NTA's affidavit shows that it has quoted the contents of a communication dated 01.09.2025 received by it from the NIC wherein NIC has stated that emails were sent to the petitioner, as well as, to his parents along with the OMR sheet, and the score card. The relevant para from the counter-affidavit of respondent no.2/NTA in which the NIC communication has been quoted reads thus:

19. That National Informatics Centre (NIC) is the technical partner of NTA in NEET (UG) 2025, and vide its Letter No.NIC/PEP/NEET/2025/17 dated 01.09.2025 it has confirmed the following:

"a) The copy of confirmation page is enclosed (ConfirmationPage-250411340690.pdf)

b) The scanned copy of OMR and candidate responses as obtained from NTA was displayed on portal on 3-June-25, 12.15 PM. The OMR and responses of the aforesaid candidate was uploaded on NIC server only once. There is no change in any of these since uploading.

c) As per record available in database server, the scanned copy of the OMR is enclosed (OMR 250411340690.jpg). The scanned copy of OMR as an attachment in jpg format was shared on candidate's (sahiljatav816@gmail.com) and parent's/guardian's (rajendrapaliwal 1653@gmail.com) email on 2025-06-03 22:34



2025:DHC:8380



with a copy to NTA in BCC at OMR12-NEETUG2025@NTA.AC.IN

d) The OMR sent on the candidate email and the one displayed to the candidate on the examination portal is the same as provided by NTA.

e) The score card email was sent to the candidate (sahiljativ816@gmail.com) and parent's/guardian's email (rajendrapaliwal1653@gmail.com) email id on 2025-06-15 05:01 with a copy to NTA in BCC at SCORECARD18- NEETUG 2025(a)NTA.A C. IN

f) The score card of the aforesaid candidate was uploaded on NIC server only once. There is no change in the document since uploading. As per record available in database server, the score card of the candidate is enclosed (Score Card-250411340690.pdf).

g) A QR Code is displayed on all scorecard. When scanned the QR code redirects to respective scorecard link on the examination portal. However, in the scorecard attached as Annexure P-5 on Page 26 of the Writ Petition, the QR code, when scanned, redirects to <https://mahareraait.mahaonline.gov.in/> which is not the official examination portal of NEET(UG) 2025.

h) The required documents of the candidate with Application Number 250411670670 are enclosed (Confirmation Page-250411670670.pdf, AdmitCard-250411670670.pdf, Score Card 250411670670.pdf);

i) The activity logs of the candidate throughout the examination lifecycle are attached (Candidate Log 250411340690.xls).

A copy of the said Letter Dated 01.09.2025 of NIC along-with the Annexures, are filed herewith as Annexure -R2/6 (COLLY). ”

(emphasis supplied)






33. Though it is not disputed by the petitioner that the OMR sheet was displayed on the portal on 3rd June 2025 at 12.15 PM, but the petitioner has not placed on record the OMR sheet to substantiate his version, and no justification is forthcoming for the same, despite having disputed his signature on original OMR sheet that was shown to the petitioner in Court




on 11.08.2025.

34. On the other hand, Mr. Khanna has again shown to the Court, the original OMR Sheet, as well as, pre-printed attendance sheet. The attendance sheet bears petitioner's signatures at two points, one appended at the time of commencement of exam and the other at its conclusion. Likewise, OMR sheet also bears petitioner's signatures. Both OMR sheet and the Attendance sheet are reproduced herein below for ready reference:

PETITIONER'S SIGNATURE ON THE OMR SHEET AS PER NTA RECORDS. (ANNEXURE R2/5)

Candidate MUST NO Answer Sheet No.  125263263			
			
DECLARATION BY THE CANDIDATE I declare that participation and signature on the OMR Answer Sheet as there and as name as in Attendance Sheet. I further declare that particulars filled in and signature as well as the copies declared on the ORIGINAL Copy is same as in PETITION Copy. I hereby declare that the OMR Answer Sheet and Test Booklet bearing No. 125263263 remains ready for any object and proper in all respects.  Signature with stamp (in running handwriting) CANDIDATE'S NAME (in running handwriting) Sahil Paliwal		WITHE R'S NAME (in running handwriting) Soniya	FATHER'S NAME (in running handwriting) Ransingh Paliwal
		SIGNATURE OF PETITIONER'S WITH TIME 1.  2.30 PM 2.  3.45 PM	



 Ministry of Education Ministry of Health and Family Welfare Government of India		National Eligibility Cum Entrance Test (UG) - 2025 Admit Card-Provisional		 एनटीई आर सी एजी National Testing Agency  एनएमसी National Medical Commission	
Roll Number:	3007206568	Application Number:	250411670670	 Candidate's Photograph	
Candidate's Name:	SAHIL PALIWAL	Father's/ Mother's Name:	RAM SINGH PALIWAL		
Gender:	Male	Date of Birth:	12-07-2006		
Category:	SC	State of Eligibility:	RAJASTHAN		
Person with Disability:	No	Scribe:	—		
Mode of Authentication during Registration Process:	Aadhaar	Type of Disability:	—	 Candidate's Signature	
		Roll Number Barcode 			



and attendance sheet, but this Court on comparing with naked eye the admitted signatures of the petitioner on the admit card (Annexure P-4) with those on the OMR sheet and attendance sheet, *prima facie* finds that there is resemblance in both the signatures. It is trite that normally the comparison of signatures and handwriting should be done by handwriting expert or anyone familiar with the handwriting of person concerned, but nothing preclude the court to compare the disputed signatures with admitted signatures, as this power is clearly available under Section 73² of the Indian Evidence Act³.

37. Furthermore, a perusal of attendance sheet reveals that it contains the pre-printed roll number and application number allotted to the petitioner, as per the records of the NTA. It also shows that that the petitioner has filled the details, such as test booklet number and booklet code, in his own handwriting. The Court also notes that the photograph of petitioner is affixed on the attendance sheet and is countersigned by two invigilators. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to believe petitioner's assertion that the signatures on the OMR sheet and the attendance sheet are not that of the petitioner.

38. The NTA is an autonomous body of Department of Higher Education under the Ministry of Education which is responsible for conducting numerous national-level exams for admission and fellowship in higher educational institutions related to engineering, medicine, management etc. The records which have been produced by the NTA thus, cannot be doubted without credible or convincing evidence, which is lacking in the present case. Besides that, there is also a presumption in favour of official records

² Equivalent to section 72 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023.

³ Ajit Savant Majagvai v. State of Karnataka: (1997) 7 SCC 110



under Section 114⁴ of the Indian Evidence Act. Reference in this regard may be had to the decision of a coordinate bench of this court in ***Selishia Mohandas Vs Union of India, Through its Director and Others 2023 SCC OnLine Del 4973***, wherein it was observed as under:

“19. There is a presumption in favour of the official record in terms of Section 114 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872. In absence of any concrete document to rebut the presumption, the correctness of the official record cannot be doubted.”

39. Rather, the test booklet placed on record suggests that the petitioner has tried to destroy the evidence by masking his roll number and name written on the said test booklet. Furthermore, non-placing on record the OMR sheet by the petitioner, which could have been the best evidence for purpose of ascertaining the correct answers, has also been deliberately withheld by the petitioner and no reasons for the same is forthcoming. Therefore, this Court is not persuaded with the contention that the documents which have been produced by the petitioner are genuine, and the petitioner himself is a victim of Cyber Crime.

40. In so far as the allegation of petitioner that the documents produced by the NTA have been manipulated, and it does not bear petitioner's signatures, the same requires leading of evidence, which cannot be resorted to while exercising summary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Similar view was taken by this court in ***Tanishq Mishra Vs NTA 2022 SCC OnLine Del 2482***, wherein it was held as under

-

“20. The upshot of the above discussion is that the petitioner does not have the response sheets to authenticate his scores, which

⁴ Equivalent to section 119 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023.



could perhaps have supported his version. On the other hand, digital records produced by NTA, system-generated e-mails, QR mismatch, response sheets with audit log, login details for accessing website, as maintained and authenticated by NIC, all point the case to the contrary. While petitioner may continue to assert that his documents are authentic, however, on the basis of facts and documents shown, this Court cannot come to this conclusion. The question of forgery and tampering of records can only be determined after the parties have been afforded an opportunity to lead evidence, and this exercise cannot be undertaken in the present proceedings. The petitioner has failed to prove his bona fides. The court remains unconvinced of the genuineness of the petitioner's documents. Thus, there is no basis to grant relief to the petitioner. ”

(Emphasis Supplied)

41. Likewise, in *Vibhuti Negi Vs National testing Agency and Anr. 2024 SCC OnLine Del 4235*, it was observed as under:

“35. No prima facie case, therefore, can even be said to have been made out by the petitioner, as could persuade this court to accept her submission that the first score card and the first response sheet should be accepted, and the second score card and second response sheet declared illegal.”

“36. Any further enquiry into the controversy would require the court to enter into a dense factual thicket, which cannot be undertaken under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Suffice it, therefore, to state that, in exercise of Article 226 jurisdiction, this Court is, in the facts before it, unable to accept the petitioner's assertion that two response sheets and two score cards had been issued by the NTA.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

42. In light of the above discussion, this court is of the view that the present case does not have any merit. Accordingly, the same is dismissed. The pending application is also dismissed.

43. It is clarified that the opinion expressed hereinabove on the



2025:DHC:8380



authenticity of documents produced by the petitioner is only *prima facie* and the petitioner is at liberty to avail any other remedy as available to him in accordance with law, if so advised.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 9, 2025/jg/dss