



\$~77

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

+ W.P.(C) 16948/2024

BHUVNESH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anuj Saxena, Mr. Anuj Ruhela,
Mr. Harsh Saxena, Mr. Manan Malik
and Shubham Sagar, Advs. along with
petitioner.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. P.S. Singh, CGSC and Mr. Amit
Acharya, G.P. with Ms. Minakshi
Singh, Mr. Rajneesh K. Sharma and
Mr. Kumar Saurabh, Advs. for R-
1/UOI.
Ms. Pankhuri Shrivastava and Mr.
Aditya Kumar, Advs. for R-2/NTA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **26.09.2025**

1. The controversy in the present petition is with regard to three questions that appeared in UGC-NET 2024 exam, that was taken by petitioner.
2. The petitioner has disputed the answers of three questions. The details of the said three questions are as under:

“A. Question I: Number of Words in the Rgveda (QID 34212313350)

Options: (1) 135816, (2) 153618, (3) 153816, (4) 135618

NTA Final Key: 153816 (Option 3)

Petitioner's Answer: 153618 (Option 2)

Texts Relied Upon: Rgveda Pratisakhya – Prof. Virendra Kumar Verma (BHU); (Sanskrita Vanmaya Kosa) by Dr. Sridhara Bhaskar Varnekar (Presidential Awardee, 1964; Sahitya Akademi Awardee, 1973).



Correct Position: None of the four options reflects authentic scholarly counts.

Defect in NTA's Approach: Relied on bare categorization without reasoning; the question is wrongly framed and invalid.

B. Question II: Classification of the Marichi Upapurana (QID 34212313384)

Options: (1) Saura, (2) Saiva, (3) Vaisnava, (4) Sakta

NTA Final Key: Vaisnava (Option 3)

Petitioner's Answer: Saiva (Option 2)

Test Relied Upon: (Sanskṛta Vanmaya ka Brhad Itihasa, Vol. XIII) – Padma Bhushan Baldev Upadhyaya.

Correct Position: Marichi Upapurana is classified as Saiva.

Defect in NTA's Approach: Expert Committee relied on Purana Paryalochanam (Dr. Srikrishnamani Tripathi, 1976) which provides bare categorization without reasoning.

C. Question III: Kalpa Sutras of the Rgveda (QID 34212313404)

Options: (1) A & B only, (2) B & D only, (3) D & C only, (4) C & A only

Where: A = Apastamba, B = Asvalayana, C = Sankhayana, D = Satyasadhya

NTA Final Key: B & D (Option 2)

Petitioner's Answer: A & B only (Option 1)

Tests Relied upon: Vaidika Sahitya evam Samskṛti – Padma Shri Kapil Dev Dwivedi; (Sanskṛta Sahitya ka Samagra Itihasa, Vol. 1) – Prof. Radhavallabh Tripathi.

Correct Position: Kalpa Sutras of Rgveda are Asvalayana (B) and Sankhayana (C) – but such an option was not provided.

Defect in NTA's Approach: No report was submitted by Expert Committee on this question. The question is defective.”

3. Mr. Anuj Saxena, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that literature pertaining to correct answers to the said questions, has been placed on record along with present petition.

4. Ms. Pankhuri Shrivastava, learned counsel appearing on behalf of



respondent no.2/NTA, on instructions, submits that the said three questions and the literature placed on record by the petitioner will be considered by the Committee of Experts in the subject of Sanskrit and a decision will be taken within a period of two weeks from today.

5. Mr. Saxena, on instructions from petitioner, who has also joined the proceedings through VC, submits that he is agreeable to such a suggestion.

6. In view of the above, the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no.2/NTA to constitute a Committee of Experts in the subject of Sanskrit, which will examine the questions, as well as, texts provided by petitioner and take a decision thereupon, within a period of two weeks from today.

7. It is further directed that in case the Committee finds favour with the contention of petitioner, necessary marks with regard to said question(s) be also awarded to petitioner and revised result be uploaded on the website, within one week thereafter.

8. It is further directed that the Committee shall grant virtual hearing to petitioner before taking a final decision.

9. The petition is disposed of, in the above terms.

10. Needless to say that petitioner shall be at liberty to approach the Court, if so advised, in case the decision taken is against the petitioner.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 26, 2025/aj