



WP(MD). No.36734 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 27.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

WP(MD)No.36734 of 2025

M.Marichamy

... Petitioner

Vs

Teachers Recruitment Board,
Rep. by Secretary,
3rd and 4th Floor,
Puratchi Thalivar Dr.M.G.R.Centenary Building,
Perasiriyar Anbazhagan Kalvi Valagam,
College Road, Nungambakkam,
Chennai – 600 006.

... Respondent

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondent to select the petitioner to the post of Post Graduate Assistant (Botany) by awarding marks to master question No.52, 76 and 101 in the Written Exam conducted in pursuance to the Notification No.02/2025 dated 10.07.2025 within the time stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Louis

For Respondent : Mr.T.Amjadkhan,
Government Advocate



WP(MD). No.36734 of 2025

ORDER

The petitioner has applied for the post of Post Graduate Assistant (Botany) pursuant to the Notification No.02/2025 dated 10.07.2025 issued by the respondent/Teachers Recruitment Board. The petitioner, with a grievance that the answer key provided by the Teachers Recruitment Board for question Nos.52, 76, 101 is wrong and it needs to be revised, has submitted a representation and filed this writ petition.

2. When this writ petition is taken up for hearing, the learned counsel on either side, has referred to the earlier order passed by this Court in W.P.No.47981 of 2025, which was filed questioning the answer key provided to various questions including question Nos.52,76, 101 and this Court, by order dated 16.12.2025, has dismissed the writ petition as under:

“6. On a perusal of the expert opinion, this Court is satisfied that the experts have opined that the answer key published by the 2nd respondent is perfectly in order.

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

8. 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 reevaluation 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 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.



WP(MD). No.36734 of 2025

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



WP(MD). No.36734 of 2025

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.”

9. In the present case, expert had already opined that the answer key published by the 2nd respondent is correct. 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.

10. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.”

3. Since the issue has already been decided by the Principal Seat in W.P.No.47981 of 2025, this Court is not inclined to entertain this writ petition.



WP(MD). No.36734 of 2025

4. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

WEB COPY

27.01.2026

ogy

Index : Yes / No.

Internet : Yes / No.

NCC : Yes / No.

To

The Secretary,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
3rd and 4th Floor,
Puratchi Thalivar Dr.M.G.R.Centenary Building,
Perasiriyar Anbazhagan Kalvi Valagam,
College Road, Nungambakkam,
Chennai – 600 006.



WEB COPY



WP(MD). No.36734 of 2025

B.PUGALENDHI, J.

ogy

WP(MD) No.36734 of 2025

27.01.2026