



W.P.No.1315 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.1315 of 2026

And

W.M.P.Nos.1490 and 1491 of 2026

P.E.Saravanan

... Petitioner

Vs.

Medical Service Recruitment Board,
Rep. By its Chairman,
Government of Tamilnadu,
No.359, Anna Salai,
DMS Complex,
Teynampet,
Chennai – 600 006.

... Respondent

Prayer:

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Declaration to declare that the petitioner is eligible for additional marks in the written examination conducted by the respondent on 07.12.2025 and consequentially eligible to be appointed as Health Inspector Grade-II pursuant to the recruitment notification No.16/MRB/2025 dated 27.10.2025.

For Petitioner : Ms.N.Kavitha Rameshwar
For Respondent : Mr.S.J.Mohamed Sathik
Government Advocate



W.P.No.1315 of 2026

ORDER

The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking issuance of Writ of Declaration to declare that the petitioner is eligible for additional marks in the written examination conducted by the respondent on 07.12.2025 and consequentially eligible to be appointed as Health Inspector Grade-II pursuant to the recruitment notification No.16/MRB/2025 dated 27.10.2025.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner belong to BC category and he completed Higher Secondary and thereafter completed Diploma in Sanitary Inspector from Pondicherry University Community College. The respondent issued recruitment notification dated 27.10.2025 for the post of Health Inspector Grade – II and the petitioner applied for the same. The respondent conducted two phase examination on 07.12.2025 and thereafter published the tentative answer key and directed the candidates to submit their objections and the petitioner submitted objections for nine questions in the Tamil Language Eligibility Test and out of the said nine questions, the respondent accepted only one question as correct and subsequently, the respondent published the



W.P.No.1315 of 2026

results, wherein, the petitioner was awarded only 18 marks out of 50 marks in the Tamil Language Eligibility Test.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner further submitted that this Court vide order dated 19.01.2026 in W.P.No.1315 of 2026 directed the respondent to refer the petitioner's objection to the Expert and to file Expert opinion before this Court, pursuant to which, Experts Team was formed and irrespective of the fact that the answers given by the petitioner for four questions are perfectly correct, the Experts Team awarded only one mark in favour of the petitioner, which is not sustainable one.

4.The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent submitted that based on the justification provided by the Experts Team, only one Tamil question was found to be valid for revision and accordingly, marks were awarded to all candidates who attempted question no.26 including the petitioner and thereafter the respondent published the final score card for the candidates those who secured minimum marks in Tamil Eligibility Test. The total marks of the candidates for those qualified in the Tamil Eligibility Test was also published in the respondent Board's website on 03.01.2026. He



W.P.No.1315 of 2026

further submitted that 2122 candidates were called for certificate verification based on the merit and communal rotation for the post of Health Inspector Grade – II from 05.01.2026 to 06.01.2026 and the selection process was completed and the provisional selection list was also published on 13.01.2026.

5.On a perusal of the expert opinion, this Court is satisfied that the experts have justified that one Tamil question was found to be valid for revision and accordingly, marks were awarded to all the candidates who attempted question no.26 including the petitioner and in respect of the other questions, the answer key published by the respondent is perfectly in order.

6.The very same issue came up for consideration before the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Vikesh Kumar Gupta and others vs. The State of Rajasthan and others** in **Civil Appeal Nos.3649 and 3650 of 2020**, wherein, it has been categorically held that "it is not permissible for the High Court to examine the question papers and answer sheets itself, particularly when the Commission has assessed the inter se merit of the candidates. The Courts have to show deference and consideration to the recommendation of the Expert



W.P.No.1315 of 2026

Committee who have the expertise to evaluate and make recommendations.”

7.For better appreciation, Paragraph No.11 of the judgment (supra) reads as follows:

"11. Though re-evaluation can be directed if rules permit, this Court has deprecated the practice of re-evaluation and scrutiny of the questions by the courts which lack expertise in academic matters. It is not permissible for the High Court to examine the question papers and answer sheets itself, particularly when the Commission has assessed the inter se merit of the candidates (Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission v. Mukesh Thakur & Anr. MANU/SC/00401/2010 : (2010) 6 SCC 759) Courts have to show deference and consideration to the recommendation of the Expert Committee who have the expertise to evaluate and make recommendations [See- Basavaiah (Dr.) v. Dr. H.L. Ramesh & Ors. MANU/SC/0530/2010 : (2010) 8 SCC 372]. Examining the scope of judicial review with regards to re-evaluation of answer sheets, this Court in Ran Vijay Singh & Ors. v. State of Uttar Pradesh & Ors. MANU/SC/1578/2017 : (2018) 2 SCC 357 held that court should not re-evaluate or scrutinize the answer sheets of a candidate as it has no expertise in the matters and the academic matters are best left to academics. This Court in the said judgment further held as follows:

"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



WEB COPY



W.P.No.1315 of 2026

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



W.P.No.1315 of 2026

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."

8.In the present case, expert had already opined that the answer key published by the respondent is correct and has also awarded extra one mark to the petitioner. Therefore, this Court cannot substitute the reasons for deferring the answers arrived at by experts. Hence, the prayer sought for in the present writ petition cannot be granted. The writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

29.01.2026

pri

Index: Yes/ No

Speaking Order: Yes/ No

NCC: Yes/ No

7/8



WEB COPY



W.P.No.1315 of 2026

M.DHANDAPANI,J.
pri

To

Medical Service Recruitment Board,
Rep. By its Chairman,
Government of Tamilnadu,
No.359, Anna Salai,
DMS Complex,
Teynampet,
Chennai – 600 006.

W.P.No.1315 of 2026
And
W.M.P.Nos.1490 and 1491 of 2026

29.01.2026

8/8