

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

267

CWP-16010-2022

Date of Decision : April 08, 2026

I.A.V. SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL

-PETITIONER

V/S

THE BOARD OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, HARYANA AND ANR.

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Pankaj Maini, Advocate
for the petitioner (Through V.C.).

Mr. K.K. Gupta, Advocate
for the respondents.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. The present writ petition impugns the order dated 26.05.2022 passed by the Board of School Education, Haryana, whereby the request of the petitioner-school for correction of the practical examination results of its science stream students has been declined.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner draws the attention of this Court to the impugned order and submits that the sole ground for rejection of the petitioner's application is delay, whereas no such limitation is prescribed under the applicable rules. It is further submitted that, even after the declaration of the results, the Deputy Secretary (Exam.) retains the authority to rectify errors therein.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondents-Board submits that the practical examination was scheduled for 08.04.2021, and the marks were required to be uploaded by 05.04.2021. The result was declared on

26.07.2021, and detailed mark sheets were issued on 09.08.2021. It is contended that no representation regarding any error in the uploading of practical examination marks was made by the petitioner-school prior to 09.08.2021, nor at any time before approaching this Court. Reference is also made to an earlier litigation (CWP-21814-2021), which was disposed of with a direction to the respondent-Board to pass a speaking order. It is further contended that the affected students themselves have not challenged the action of the respondent-Board, rendering the present writ petition not maintainable.

4. This Court has considered the rival submissions. A perusal of Rule 61 of the Rules and Regulations of the Board of School Education, Haryana, holds significance and is germane to the disposal of the case at hand. The scope of Rule 61 is limited and reads as follows:-

“61. RECTIFICATION OF RESULTS :

(A) The Chairman shall have the power to quash the result of a candidate after it has been declared, if

(i) He/she is disqualified for using unfair means in the Examination;
or

(ii) a mistake is found in his/her result; or

(iii) He/she is found ineligible to appear in the examination; or

(iv) He/she is a person against whom action under regulation 45 i.e. Cancellation of Admission could have been taken, had the facts come to the notice of the Board earlier.

Note :

(A) Before cancellation of the result or making any change in the result already declared, the candidate would be given the opportunity to explain his position against the proposed action of the Board.

(B) The Deputy Secretary (Exam.) shall have the power to rectify all mistakes in the results except from Qualified to Needs proficiency Enhancement (N.P.E.) Partial Achievement/cancelled for which the approval of the Secretary will be necessary.”

5. A plain reading of the hereinabove extracted Rule makes it manifest that the Deputy Secretary (Exam.) is vested with the authority to rectify all errors in results, except from “Qualified” to “Needs Proficiency Enhancement (N.P.E.)”, “Partial Achievement/Cancelled”, for which the approval of the Secretary is required.

6. In the present case, the petitioner sought rectification of practical marks on the ground of an error during the uploading process of results. However, the respondent-Board has not examined as to whether such an error in fact occurred. The rejection of the petitioner’s request rests solely on the ground of delay. This Court is of the considered view that such a ground, by itself, is insufficient to deny the relief sought. The respondent-Board is obligated, in terms of Rule 61, to determine whether any error has occurred and whether it has affected the concerned students. Such an exercise is conspicuously absent in the present case.

7. Accordingly, the present **writ petition is disposed of** with a direction to the respondent-Board to reconsider the matter afresh. The respondent-Board shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and pass a fresh reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

8. In the event that the respondent-Board requires any records from the petitioner-school, the same shall be furnished expeditiously in accordance with law.

April 08, 2026
Poonam Sharma/devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No