CGHC010352602022 2026:CGHC:46375

AFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 4650 of 2022

Judgment Reserved On :23.09.2026.

Judgment Delivered On : 03.11.2026.

Garima D/o Rakesh Pandey Aged About 23 Years Occupation Student, R/o Village Semarsal, P.S. Jarhagaon, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - Chhattisgarh Yavsayik Pariksha Mandal, Raipur (Vyapam) Through The Secretary, Vyapam Bhawan North Block Sector -19, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District Raipur Chhattigarh.

2 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Principal Secretary General Administrative Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Parth Kumar Jha, Advocate.
For Respondent No.1	:	Dr. Saurabh Kumar Pande, Advocate.
For State/Respondent	:	Mr. Abhishek Gupta, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

C A V Order

1. By way of this petition, the petitioner is seeking indulgence of this Court in its extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to treat the marks secured by the petitioner i.e. 89.907 marks in the Teacher Eligibility Test {TET}, 2022 as 90 marks on the strength of the rule of rounding off is which is based on logic and common sense as if a fractional part is one half or more, its value shall increased to one and if a fractional

part is less than half then its value shall be ignored. Further, the petitioner also seeks to challenge the options of multiple choice question No.145 and prays for the following reliefs:-

> *" 10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call for the entire records relating to this case.*
> *10.2 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to allow the petition direct the Vyapam to treat the option 'C' as correct answer in respect of question no. 145, in the interest of justice.*
> *10.3 That any other relief, which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper together with cost of the petition.*

2. Brief facts of the case are that the Vyapam issued an advertisement inviting applications from eligible candidates for appearing in the TET-2022 Examination, which was scheduled to be held on 18.09.2022. The petitioner was pursuing M.Sc. (Final Year – Mathematics) and, being eligible for the aforesaid examination, submitted her application for appearing in the TET-2022 Examination. The petitioner duly appeared in the aforesaid examination and participated in the examination in accordance with the prescribed procedure. The petitioner's OMR answer sheet bears No. 921886. The question paper relating to Mathematics/Science, Part-IV-A, containing the relevant question is filed as Annexure P/4. After conducting the examination, the Vyapam published the model answer key and invited objections from the candidates in respect of the answers contained therein. The candidates were accordingly granted an opportunity to raise objections to the model answer key. After considering the objections received from the candidates, the Vyapam published the final answer key (Annexure P/6). Thereafter, the

Vyapam declared the final result of the examination, wherein the petitioner secured 89.907 marks (Annexure P/7). As per the instructions/guidelines issued by the Vyapam, a candidate belonging to the Unreserved Category was required to secure a minimum of 60% marks for qualifying in the examination. Since the examination carried a total of 150 marks, the petitioner was required to secure at least 90 marks. Upon carefully examining her answers vis-à-vis the answer key, the petitioner found that in respect of Question No. 145, she had selected Option ‘C’ – UNIVAC. The said question contained the following four options:

Which one of the following computers is the world's first commercial Computer?

(A)MANIAC (B)ENIAC

(C)UNIVAC (D) EDSAC

3. In the initial model answer key published by the Vyapam, the correct answer to Question No. 145 was indicated as Option ‘C’ – UNIVAC. However, in the final answer key, the answer was subsequently changed and Option ‘B’ – ENIAC was declared to be the correct answer. Consequently, the answer ‘C’ marked by the petitioner was treated as incorrect and the corresponding mark was denied to her. It is respectfully submitted that the answer ‘C’ – UNIVAC selected by the petitioner is supported by several authoritative and educational sources, which recognize UNIVAC as the first commercially successful/commercial computer. The Computer Science textbook for Class XI published by the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) describes UNIVAC-I as the first electronic computer of its generation and records its

use for business applications (Annexure P/9). The study material published by IGNOU, available online, also describes UNIVAC as the first commercially successful computer. The competitive examination magazine Pariksha Manthan, 2021 edition, also recognizes UNIVAC as the first commercial computer. In view of the aforesaid material and authoritative sources, the answer ‘C’ – UNIVAC, as selected by the petitioner, cannot be treated as an incorrect answer. The subsequent alteration of the answer in the final answer key from ‘C’ to ‘B’ has resulted in the petitioner being deprived of one mark. Consequently, the petitioner secured 89.907 marks instead of the requisite 90 marks, thereby being deprived of the benefit of qualifying in the examination. The action of the respondents in treating the petitioner’s answer to Question No. 145 as incorrect and consequently deducting one mark is arbitrary, unreasonable, contrary to the available authoritative material, and has caused serious prejudice and injustice to the petitioner.

4. Mr. Parth Kumar Jha, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner duly appeared in the TET-2022 Examination and secured 89.907 marks, whereas 90 marks were required for qualifying in the Unreserved Category. In Question No. 145, the petitioner had selected Option ‘C’ – UNIVAC, which was also declared as the correct answer in the initial model answer key issued by the respondents. However, in the final answer key, the respondents changed the answer from ‘C’ – UNIVAC to ‘B’ – ENIAC, thereby treating the petitioner’s answer as incorrect and depriving her of one mark. The answer UNIVAC is supported by recognized educational sources, including material published by , which describe UNIVAC as the first commercial/commercially successful computer. The denial of the said one

mark has resulted in the petitioner securing 89.907 marks instead of the required 90 marks, thereby causing direct and substantial prejudice to her and the action of the respondents in changing the answer and denying the petitioner the said mark, despite the initial answer key and authoritative material supporting her answer, is arbitrary, unreasonable and unjust, and has caused serious prejudice to the petitioner. The petitioner, therefore, respectfully prays that the respondents be directed to award one mark for Question No. 145, re-calculate her result, and grant her all consequential benefits.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner places reliance upon the order dated 04.08.2026 passed by this Court in ***Vidhata Gupta (Minor) vs. The State of Chhattisgarh and Others***, WPC No. 4054 of 2026, wherein, in somewhat similar circumstances, the petitioner therein, a minor student seeking admission to Class IX in Prayas Residential School, Ambikapur, had been denied admission on the ground that he had secured 59.7% marks in Class VIII against the prescribed requirement of 60% marks. The said petitioner had, however, qualified in the entrance examination by securing 82 marks out of 100 and had fulfilled all other eligibility conditions. This Court, taking note of the marginal shortfall of 0.3%, the fact that the petitioner's application had initially been entertained and he was permitted to participate in the entrance examination, and the fact that the matter concerned admission of a minor child to a State-run residential school, held that the principle of rounding off could be applied and directed the authorities to treat 59.7% as 60% for the purpose of admission.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner herein is similarly situated and that the factual circumstances of the present case are substantially comparable to those considered by this Court in ***Vidhata Gupta (Minor)***. It is, therefore, contended that the petitioner is entitled to the same treatment and benefit on the principle of parity. Accordingly, learned counsel prays that, following the aforesaid order, appropriate relief may also be granted to the petitioner herein.

7. Dr. Saurabh Kumar Pande, counsel for Respondent No.1 submits that the reliefs as sought by the petitioner cannot be granted as on the basis of Option B- ENIAC many candidates have successfully passed the TET examination. He submits that the persons who specialize in that field are chosen to decide the most appropriate correct answers for examination questions and only for the reason that petitioner deems Option C-UNIVAC as the most chooseable nearabout answer for the Question No.145, the same cannot be accepted. Further, so far as petitioner's prayer for making his marks as 90 by rounding of his secured marks of 89.907 is concerned, it is submitted that the competition exams nowadays are all about cut-throat competition and even a fraction of a mark may determine the relative position of a candidate in the merit list and may ultimately decide his selection or non-selection. The marks obtained by each candidate are, therefore, required to be assessed strictly as actually secured, without extending any benefit of rounding off unless the governing rules or the examination scheme specifically provide for the same. It is submitted that permitting rounding off in such competitive examinations may result in altering the *inter se* merit of the candidates. A candidate securing 89.907 marks, if treated as having secured

90 marks, would be placed on an equal footing with a candidate who has actually secured 90 marks, thereby creating an artificial equivalence between candidates who have obtained different marks.

8. Learned counsel for the State would support the submission put forth by counsel for Respondent No.1.

9. I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the documents annexed with the petition carefully.

10. The first issue which arises for consideration is whether this Court, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, should interfere with the answer declared to be correct by the examination authority in respect of Question No.145.

11. It is by now well settled that the scope of judicial review in matters relating to academic examinations, particularly in respect of correctness of answers to objective-type questions, is extremely limited. The Court does not possess the expertise to sit as an appellate authority over the decision of the subject experts engaged by the examination authority.

12. In ***Ran Vijay Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh***, **(2018) 2 SCC 357**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, after considering the earlier decisions on the subject, has laid down the governing principles. The Court, inter alia, held that where the rules do not provide for re-evaluation, interference can be made only in rare or exceptional cases where a material error is demonstrated clearly and without resort to an inferential process of reasoning or rationalisation. The Court further held that the correctness of the key answers ought ordinarily to be presumed and that, in case of doubt, the benefit should go to the

examination authority rather than to the candidate. Paragraph 30 to 32 of the said judgment reads as under:-

> *"**30.** The law on the subject is therefore, quite clear and we only propose to highlight a few significant conclusions. They are:*
> ***30.1.** 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;*
> ***30.2.** 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;*
> ***30.3.** The court should not at all re-evaluate or scrutinise the answer sheets of a candidate—it has no expertise in the matter and academic matters are best left to academics;*
> ***30.4.** The court should presume the correctness of the key answers and proceed on that assumption; and*
> ***30.5.** In the event of a doubt, the benefit should go to the examination authority rather than to the candidate.*
> ***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."*

13. Also, the aforesaid principle has also been reiterated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Chief General Manager, BSNL & Others v. M.J. Paul & Others*, reported in 2023 LiveLaw (SC) 414.** In the said case, the Supreme Court disapproved the course adopted by the High Court in undertaking an independent factual and evaluative exercise in relation to the answer sheet and held that such matters ought ordinarily to be left to the competent examination authorities. The relevant observations in paragraphs 8 to 12 of the said judgment emphasise that the High Court should not substitute its own assessment for that of the competent authority, particularly when re-evaluation

is not contemplated under the applicable rules. Relevant paragraph Nos.6 to 12 of the **M.J. Paul (supra)** reads as under:-

> ***6.*** *Learned counsel for the respondent has attempted his best to support the order impugned and has contended that the High Court has indeed examined the answer-sheet and found want of evaluation of a part of the answers. As regards awarding of marks, learned counsel would submit that it had not been in dispute before the High Court that if those two omitted entries were evaluated, the appellant would have cleared the examination.*
>
> ***7*** *. Learned counsel has also referred to an order dated 04.11.2011 passed by the Tribunal in O.A. No.14191 of 2010 and has submitted that in the said case too, the similarly circumstanced employee was granted relief by the Tribunal but the order so passed in favour of the said employee was not challenged by the appellants.*
>
> ***8.*** *Having given thoughtful consideration to the rival submissions and having examined the record, we are constrained to interfere with the order impugned and we are clearly of the view that neither interference in the order passed by the Tribunal in the present matter was justified nor the final directions and reliefs as granted by the High Court were justified.*
>
> ***9****. We are not entering into the aspect as to whether the said answers at page 27 and 29 were evaluated or not but, prima facie, with reference to the photo-replica placed before us, it cannot be said that the answer as a whole had not been evaluated by the examiner. In fact, we do not wish to make any further comment beyond this for, we are clearly of the view, that if at all anything of such a nature was to be examined with reference to the instructions said to have been issued by the Government, the only appropriate course for the High Court was to leave it for the authorities concerned to examine, as was the course adopted by the Tribunal in the said order dated 04.11.2011.*
>
> ***10.*** *In the present case, the High Court has proceeded not only to record a finding on non- evaluation but thereafter, has proceeded to record rather assumptive findings as if those pages, when evaluated, were likely to result only in positive marks in favour of the respondent.*

> ***11****. In fact, adopting of such a course and process has not been countenanced by this Court and it has repeatedly been observed that all such steps ought to be left to the authority concerned and in fact, re-evaluation is not to be resorted to when not provided for in the Rules.*
>
> ***12****. Yet another aspect of the matter had been that the High Court was considering a writ petition arising from the order of the Tribunal. In such a writ petition, adopting the course of factual analysis and rendering the finding on facts was not warranted. The course as adopted by the High Court and the directions as finally issued cannot be countenanced.*

14. The Patna High Court, in ***Pawani Prabha v. Union of India through its Secretary*****, Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12297 of 2026**, while dealing with disputes concerning the evaluation of competitive examinations, has also emphasised the necessity of maintaining fairness, transparency and procedural regularity in the examination process. At the same time, the Court has reiterated that judicial interference with the evaluation undertaken by an expert body must remain within the permissible limits of judicial review. The observations made therein also underline that mere apprehension or dissatisfaction on the part of an individual candidate cannot justify interference with the examination result in the absence of convincing material demonstrating illegality or procedural irregularity. Relevant paragraphs Nos.37, 39, 46 and 55 reads as under:-

> ***37.*** *The dispute in such cases may not necessarily be whether the candidates actually scored higher marks as claimed or otherwise, but whether the examination authority is able to satisfy the Court by producing a credible, continuous and verifiable evidentiary trail connecting the candidates who entered the examination hall, the OMR sheets allegedly filled by them, the digital images generated therefrom, the marks calculated on the basis thereof, and*

the scores ultimately published. The NTA is duty-bound and obliged to demonstrate its bona fides through proper documentation and a technically verifiable explanation. At the same time, the Court, in such circumstances, has a constitutional obligation to ensure that public examination processes remain fair, transparent and non- arbitrary, while also maintaining judicial restraint in academic matters.

39. *Coming to a case where a candidate calls in question the legality, correctness and propriety of the action of the respondent NTA in publishing an incorrect and inconsistent scanned OMR answer sheet in respect of her NEET UG 2026 examination, involving an erroneous evaluation of her performance and award of only 159 marks, in the case of Pihu Singh Vs. Union of India & Ors, W.P.(C) No. 3848 of 2026, the Division Bench of the High Court of Chhattisgarh at Bilaspur has held that the jurisdiction of the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, though wide, is required to be exercised with restraint in matters concerning academic and Patna High Court CWJC No.12297 of 2026 dt.05-10-2026 competitive examinations, unless the decision-making process is shown to be arbitrary, irrational, discriminatory, mala fide or demonstrably contrary to the prescribed procedures. The Court ought not to interfere with the evaluation undertaken by an expert examining body. The Court further pointed out that the claim of the candidate that she had attempted all 180 questions could not be accepted in preference to the responses actually recorded in the original OMR answer sheet, particularly when the said original document had been produced before the Court and shown to the petitioner herself. The award of 159 marks based upon 46 correct and 25 incorrect responses out of 71 attempted questions, therefore, called for no interference.*

46. *Now, coming to the facts of the present cases, it is true that the petitioners are aspiring to pursue MBBS courses and that the result of NEET-UG 2026 is of considerable importance to their academic careers. This Court is also conscious that even small differences in marks may have a substantial bearing upon the prospects of a candidate in a highly competitive examination. At the same time, however, mere sympathy or possible academic consequences of the result cannot constitute a ground for directing alteration of*

an examination record which has been produced in original and found to contain the responses on the basis of which the petitioners have been evaluated. This Court is also conscious of the judicial restraint required to balance the individual grievance of a candidate with the larger requirement of maintaining the sanctity, uniformity and finality of the competitive examination process.

55. *The National Testing Agency conducts the NEET- UG Examination on a national scale through a standardized process. Judicial interference with the evaluation process based solely upon an individual's apprehension, unsupported by convincing evidence, would adversely affect the certainty, sanctity and finality of the examination system. Merely because, by an interim order, a candidate may have been permitted to participate in counselling, subject to the final enquiry or outcome of the case on the peculiar facts and circumstances of that case, such an order does not constitute a binding precedent. Moreover, in the present cases, the petitioners have failed to establish any arbitrariness, illegality, mala fides or procedural irregularity on the part of the respondent authorities in the evaluation of their answer sheets. This Court has also perused Patna High Court CWJC No.12297 of 2026 dt.05-10-2026 the original OMR sheets of all the candidates and compared the signatures of the petitioners with the signatures appearing on the attendance sheets, Vakalatnamas and affidavits and found some variation. However, as this Court has rightly observed in the foregoing paragraphs, the signatures of any candidate or person are subject to inherent variations, and such variation in signatures appearing on some documents, by itself, cannot constitute a ground to contend that the OMR sheets had been tampered with or swapped, as sought to be contended by the learned Advocates for the petitioners. If the petitioners still dispute the genuineness of the OMR sheets duly produced before this Court, in such circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that the disputed questions of fact are required to be adjudicated upon by a competent Civil Court, requiring elaborate examination of witnesses and documentary evidence to establish the respective claims.*

15. The aforesaid principle assumes greater significance in a case involving a multiple-choice question where more than one answer may, depending upon the source or context, appear to be plausible. The Court is not required to determine which answer is more acceptable merely on the basis of competing academic material placed by an individual candidate.

16. In the present case, the petitioner has relied upon certain educational and reference materials to contend that UNIVAC is described as the first commercial or commercially successful computer. However, the final answer key has been prepared by the examination authority after considering the objections and with the assistance of persons having requisite subject expertise. The fact that certain reference materials may describe UNIVAC as the first commercially successful computer does not, by itself, establish that the answer determined by the expert body, namely Option ‘B’—ENIAC, is so manifestly and demonstrably erroneous as to warrant interference under Article 226 of the Constitution.

17. It is also relevant that the petitioner seeks substitution of the answer accepted by the expert body on the basis of an alternative interpretation of the expression “first commercial computer”. Such an exercise would necessarily require this Court to enter into an academic evaluation of the question and the competing answers. The same is impermissible in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

18. The mere circumstance that Option ‘C’ was mentioned as the correct answer in the provisional/model answer key does not confer an indefeasible right upon the petitioner to have the same retained in the final answer key. The

very purpose of inviting objections to a model answer key is to enable the examination authority to reconsider the answers before finalising the key. The final answer key, having been issued after consideration of the objections, cannot be interfered with merely because the change has adversely affected the petitioner.

19. Consequently, this Court finds no ground to interfere with the final answer key in respect of Question No.145.

20. The second issue relates to the petitioner's prayer for treating 89.907 marks as 90 marks by applying the principle of rounding off.

21. There can be no quarrel with the general mathematical principle that a fractional number may, in appropriate circumstances, be rounded off to the nearest whole number. However, the question before this Court is not one of mathematical computation but whether a candidate can claim a legal right to rounding off marks for the purpose of satisfying a prescribed minimum qualifying standard.

22. The qualifying criteria prescribed for the examination require a candidate belonging to the Unreserved Category to secure 60% marks. Out of 150 marks, the prescribed qualifying threshold is therefore 90 marks. The petitioner admittedly secured 89.907 marks. Thus, she has not secured the prescribed minimum qualifying marks.

23. In the absence of any rule, regulation, advertisement or examination scheme providing for rounding off of marks for determining eligibility, this Court cannot introduce such a mechanism by judicial fiat. The prescription of minimum qualifying marks is a matter falling within the domain of the

examination authority. A candidate who has secured 89.907 marks cannot, merely on the basis of mathematical approximation, be treated as having actually secured 90 marks.

24. The reliance placed upon the order passed in ***Vidhata Gupta (Minor) v. State of Chhattisgarh & Others*** does not advance the petitioner's case. The said order was rendered in the peculiar facts and circumstances of that case, keeping in view, inter alia, the nature of the admission involved, the status of the petitioner therein as a minor child, the marginal shortfall and the other surrounding circumstances. The said order cannot be construed as laying down an inflexible proposition that rounding off must invariably be applied whenever a candidate falls marginally short of the prescribed qualifying marks.

25. Moreover, the present case concerns a competitive eligibility examination in which the marks obtained by each candidate have a direct bearing upon qualification and, in appropriate cases, upon subsequent selection and merit. Extending the benefit of rounding off to one candidate, in the absence of any enabling provision, may have consequences for the inter se position of candidates who have secured marks strictly in accordance with the prescribed evaluation scheme.

26. The Court is conscious of the fact that the petitioner's shortfall is extremely marginal. However, sympathy, equity or the smallness of the deficiency cannot substitute the eligibility criteria prescribed by the competent authority. The Court cannot dilute an expressly prescribed minimum qualifying standard merely because the candidate has fallen short by a fraction of a mark.

27. The principle enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ran Vijay Singh*** also cautions the constitutional courts against interfering with examination results merely because a particular candidate perceives an injustice. The examination process is required to attain finality and certainty, and the Court must be slow to interfere with an evaluation process undertaken by the competent examination authority.

28. In the present case, neither has the petitioner been able to demonstrate any patent or manifest error in the final answer key nor has she been able to point out any provision under which marks can be rounded off for the purpose of determining qualification. Consequently, neither of the grounds raised by the petitioner warrants interference in exercise of the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court.

29. For the foregoing reasons, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has failed to establish any illegality, perversity, arbitrariness or violation of any statutory right warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

30. Accordingly, the writ petition is **dismissed.**

31. It is made clear that the dismissal of the present petition is confined to the reliefs claimed herein and shall not preclude the petitioner from participating in any future examination or selection process for which she may otherwise be eligible in accordance with the applicable rules.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

Avinash

The date when the judgment is reserved	The date when the judgment is pronounced	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	
		Operative	Full
23.09.2026	03.11.2026	------	03.11.2026

HEAD NOTE:-

(WPC No. 4650 of 2022)

While exercising judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the Court is required to examine whether the action of the authorities suffers from any illegality, arbitrariness, irrationality, mala fides or procedural irregularity. However, the power of judicial review is required to be exercised within its permissible limits, and the Court must refrain from substituting its own assessment for that of the competent authority in matters falling within its domain. Judicial interference is warranted only when a demonstrable illegality or procedural impropriety is established by cogent material.