



2026:DHC:2346-DB



\$~30

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**+ **W.P.(C) 6425/2025 & CM APPL. 57907/2025****MEENAKSHI MEENA**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kunal Tandon, Sr. Adv.
with Mr. Nitesh Mehra, Ms. Ananya Sikri
and Ms. Natasha, Advs.

versus

**THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI THROUGH REGISTRAR
GENERAL AND ANR & ANR.**

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Kanika Agnihotri and Ms.
Shivani, Advs. for DHC.

Mr. Dibyanshu Pandey, Mr. Vinayak
Sameer, Mr. Radhe Shyam Sharma and Mr.
Yaseer Jilani, Advs. for R-3.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA****JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

%

11.03.2026**C. HARI SHANKAR, J.**

1. The petitioner was an aspirant to the Delhi Judicial Services. She underwent the Delhi Judicial Service Main Examination (Written) of 2023, which was held on 13 April 2024.

2. Inasmuch as the issue is squarely covered by the judgment of this Bench in *Prerna Gupta v. Registrar General of Delhi High Court¹*, we do not deem it necessary to burden this order with any detailed allusion to facts.



2026:DHC:2346-DB



3. Suffice it to state that the grievance of the petitioner is that the marks awarded to her, in one of the questions which she attempted, had been reduced from 5 to 3, which jeopardised her chances of success and consequential appointment as a judicial officer.

4. Though the petitioner advanced, in the writ petition, a contention that the change had been made without a corresponding signature of the examiner, the respondent, in its counter affidavit, has clarified that every change was duly initialled by the examiner but that, in order not to disclose the identity of the examiner, the signature is masked when the copies of the answer sheets are provided to the candidates.

5. The plea that changes were made without any corresponding signature of the examiner is, therefore, clearly incorrect, though the petitioner may have advanced the plea *bona fide*.

6. In so far as the legal issues in controversy are concerned, the law stands settled that, in the absence of any proscription to that effect, there is no absolute bar to the examiner changing the marks once awarded. The changes have taken place in the present case before the papers were submitted to the examining authority.

7. In fact, Ms. Kanika Agnihotri, learned Counsel who appears for the High Court submits that, in certain answers, the marks of the petitioner were in fact increased and that, therefore, it is not as though the change in marks was in any way vitiated by lack of *bona fides*.



2026:DHC:2346-DB



8. In these circumstances, we regret that it is not possible for us to come to the aid of the petitioner, as the case stands fully covered by our decision in *Prerna Gupta*.

9. Mr. Nitish Mehra, learned Counsel who appears for the petitioner also presses prayer (d), which seeks framing of guidelines to ensure transparency in the checking process.

10. No writ of *mandamus* can be issued to any administrative authority to frame guidelines, as has been held by the Supreme Court in *Union of India v. K. Pushpavanam*² and *State of J&K v. A R Zakki*³.

11. Nonetheless, we are sanguine that this Court, on the administrative side, would look into the matter.

12. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.

MARCH 11, 2026/gunn

² (2023) 20 SCC 736
³ 1992 Supp (1) SCC 548