



\$~34

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 11708/2024

SH. RAZVEER @ RAJVEER SINGHPetitioner

Through: Mr. Aayushmaan Vatsyayana,
Ms. Aditi Warriar, Mr. Manas
Tripathi, Mr. Gourav and
Mr. Vansh Pandey, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhishek Yadav, SPC with
Mr. Amit Acharya, Govt.
Pleader.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **16.03.2026**

1. The present Petition is filed assailing order dated 25.01.2021 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi in O.A. 3169/2016 (hereinafter “**impugned order**”) whereby, the original application filed by the Petitioner was dismissed.

2. Briefly stated, the Petitioner had appeared in examinations held by the Railway Recruitment Board to select candidates for certain Group ‘D’ posts. The written examination was conducted in objective format and was to be answered through the medium of OMR sheets. The Petitioner initially successfully cleared the written examination, followed by the physical and medical examination, however, his candidature was subsequently rejected for violation of examination conditions as it was observed by the competent authority during post



examination scrutiny that the applicant had done certain “*cutting and erasing*” on his OMR sheet.

3. The Petitioner filed an original application before the learned Tribunal challenging the order of the competent authority cancelling his candidature, which was dismissed *vide* the impugned order observing that the candidature of the Petitioner was rightly rejected for violation of examination conditions, which stipulated that the candidates shall not do any “*cutting or erasing*” in the OMR sheets.

4. The learned Tribunal after perusing the original OMR sheet of the Petitioner noted that he had made certain cuttings in the entry pertaining to the centre of examination and made certain erasures in the control number and in question no. 45 and concluded that the Petitioner had violated the examination conditions.

5. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner has only made minor erasures in the OMR sheet pertaining to the control number and in one question (Q. 45). He submits that the candidature of the Petitioner ought not be rejected and instead his OMR sheet be evaluated while denying him marks for the question in which erasures were made.

6. He submits that the Petitioner was initially declared successful in the written examination and subsequently has also cleared the medical and physical examination. He submits that the Petitioner should have been informed about his disqualification at an earlier stage and not after going through the entire recruitment process.

7. He further submitted that the OMR sheet does not state that the candidate will be disqualified if there is any erasure or cutting in the OMR sheet and the same is only a suggestion so that the OMR sheet can be evaluated correctly electronically.



8. *Per Contra*, the learned counsel for the Respondents submits that the impugned order suffers from no infirmity and consequently prayed that the present petition may be dismissed.

9. At the outset, it is pertinent to note that the OMR sheet used in the subject examination explicitly prohibited erasure of any answer by using a whitener or a blade in the OMR sheet.

10. Appositely, even Instruction no. 9, on the backside of the OMR sheet, specifically directed that the candidates ought to darken the selected circle for each answer and once darkened no changes were permitted in the OMR sheet. Instruction No. 12 further explicitly clarified that failure to adhere to the instructions would render the answer sheet as invalid and will not be evaluated.

11. Once the OMR sheet explicitly states that the candidates are not allowed to use a whitener to change answers in the OMR sheet, the Petitioner cannot claim that the same is merely a suggestion and cannot lead to his disqualification.

12. Admittedly, the Petitioner has used a whitener in the OMR sheet in question no. 45 and in the column for the Control Number. The same is undeniably a violation of the directions as provided in the OMR sheet.

13. It is the contention of the Petitioner that he shall only be denied the marks for Question No. 45 and be evaluated accordingly. The same has already been considered by the learned Tribunal and rightly denied. The learned Tribunal rightly noted that once there is violation of conditions, the consequences thereof cannot be confined to the relevant question, as regards which, the deviation was attempted. Once the Petitioner has admittedly violated the rules/instructions as stipulated in the OMR sheet, he cannot be granted any leniency as the



rules have to be uniformly applied to all candidates.

14. The Petitioner would not be the only candidate whose candidature was rejected after post examination scrutiny on account of making erasures in the OMR sheet. The Petitioner cannot be permitted to steal a march over them merely because he has approached the court for relief and others have not.

15. In view of the above, we find no infirmity in the impugned order. The present petition is dismissed along with pending application(s), if any.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MARCH 16, 2026

DV