



{1}

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

918 WRIT PETITION NO. 2748 OF 2026

Manoj Suryakant Ghodke

VERSUS

The Principal Shahid Bhagatsingh College And Others

.....

Mr. Shaikh Mohammad Naseer A., Advocate for the Petitioner

Mr. R.S. Wani, AGP for Respondent No.3-State

.....

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.

DATE : 08 APRIL, 2026

PER COURT [Per Hiten S. Venegavkar, J.]:-

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking a direction to the respondents to declare the correct result of the petitioner in the subject of Personal and Financial Administration for the Second Year Examination held on 27.10.2020.

2. The petitioner states that he was a student of respondent No. 1– College for the academic year 2018–2019 in the Faculty of Master of Arts and that he completed the First Year examination on 23.02.2019. It is further submitted that the Second Year examination, which was held in the year 2020, fell during the period when the entire country was undergoing the COVID-19 pandemic. The Second Year examination was, therefore, conducted between 24.10.2020 and 28.10.2020 through an online mode, and the students were required to participate in the

{2}

said examination online. The result of the said examination was declared on 20.03.2022. The petitioner was shown absent in one paper, i.e., the 7th paper in the subject of Personal and Financial Administration, which was held on 27.10.2020. It is the contention of the petitioner that he had appeared online for the said examination and had submitted his answer sheet. However, the petitioner contends that the result declared by the respondent authorities on 20.03.2022 is not correct and needs to be corrected. The petitioner, therefore, seeks issuance of necessary directions to the respondent authorities to publish the correct result of the petitioner for the Second Year examination.

3. The learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that, in support of his claim that he had appeared for the examination, the petitioner relies upon certain documents showing screenshots of WhatsApp messages wherein there is a discussion regarding the question paper submitted by the petitioner. It is stated therein that out of 50 questions, 49 were answered by the petitioner. According to the learned advocate, this material is sufficient to demonstrate that the petitioner had appeared for the said examination and had submitted the answer sheet. He further submits that the result showing the petitioner as absent for the said paper is absolutely incorrect. He further states that the petitioner had also sought information in that regard under the

Right to Information Act; however, the department informed him that there is no record available to show that the petitioner had appeared for the said examination. He, therefore, submits that on the basis of the communications annexed to the petition, the petition deserves to be allowed and the correct result be declared.

4. We have gone through the petition and have also perused the documents annexed thereto. Firstly, it is necessary to note that the examination which took place in the year 2020, the result of which was declared on 20.03.2022, was well within the knowledge of the petitioner. The said fact can be observed from the communications made by the petitioner to the respondent authority clearly referring to the result which declared the petitioner as absent. From March 2022 till the filing of the present petition, there is nothing on record to show that the petitioner has challenged the said result, except by making a few representations to the Department. The contention of the learned advocate for the petitioner that the petitioner came to know about the same only after making a communication with the Department is absolutely incorrect, as the record is contrary to such contention. Secondly, the issue raised by the petitioner before this Court in the present writ petition pertains to disputed questions of fact. The claim of the petitioner that he had appeared for the examination online and had

{4}

submitted the answer sheet is required to be demonstrated by cogent material placed on record. The reliance placed on certain WhatsApp communications, wherein a third person has deliberately asked some questions, does not even remotely suggest that the petitioner had in fact appeared for the said examination. Thus, in the absence of any reliable material in support of the petitioner's claim, the writ petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

S P Rane