



\$~75

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

+ **W.P.(C) 18802/2025 & CM APPL. 78264/2025**

ANAS RAZA

....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner-in-Person
versus

NATITIONAL TESTING AGENCY(NTA) & ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Khanna, Advocate Ms. Pragma Bhushan, Advocate Ms. Vilakshana Dayma, Advocate Mr. Saurabh Pandey, Advocate Ms. Anshu Kumari, Advocate for NTA Mr. Mohinder JS Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Ms. Tripta Sharma Advs. for University of Delhi

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

%

19.03.2026

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:-

“a) Issue a writ of mandamus or certiorari directing Respondent No. 1 (NTA) to award the Petitioner 5 marks for the questioned item “heart of the computer”, or alternatively evaluate the question as having two correct answers, thereby revising the Petitioner’s score to 156;

b) Direct Respondent Nos. 2–4 (University of Delhi) to grant admission to the Petitioner in the LL.B (3-year) Course for Academic Year 2025- 26, against available vacant seats, based on his correct score of 156 and cut-off of 155;



c) Direct NTA and DU to produce the complete record of answer-key challenge, evaluation log, and Petitioner's complaint dated 09.05.2025;

d) Pass appropriate interim relief directing DU to reserve one LL.B seat for the Petitioner pending final disposal of the petition;..."

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner appeared in the CUET-PG 2025 Entrance Exam for L.L.B, conducted by respondent No. 1 on 25.03.2025 under roll No. UP090300558.

3. In April 20205, the respondent No. 1 released the provisional answer key. The petitioner calculated his score to be 156 marks.

4. On 24.04.2025, the petitioner submitted a formal online challenge to Question No. 18 (QID 17807021777). The said question reads as under:-

"Which of the following is known as the heart of the computer?"

Options:

(Option 1) CPU

(Option 2) Motherboard

(Option 3) Speaker

(Option 4) Scanner

5. The petitioner had marked the answer to the said Question No. 18 as Option 2, whereas the correct answer was Option 1. The respondent No. 1 released the final result and petitioner's scorecard reflected 151 marks.

6. The petitioner filed complaint with the respondent No. 1, however, the same remains unanswered.

7. Aggrieved by the inaction of the respondent No. 1, the petitioner approached the Dean Admission, University of Delhi and also, Dean,



Faculty of Law, informing of them of the said discrepancy, however, they did not entertain his grievances.

8. Hence, the present petition.

9. Mr. Raza, petitioner-in-person, states that he is a meritorious candidate and has drawn my attention to a report published by Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineering (IEEE) and also to a book namely “PC Hardware in a Nutshell”, to urge that Motherboard is the heart of the computer.

10. Mr. Khanna, learned counsel for the respondent No. 1, states that in the present case, the objection of the petitioner was duly forwarded to the subject expert and in opinion of the subject expert the correct answer to the said question is CPU i.e., Option 1. He further draws my attention to the response of the subject expert as well to a book namely “Information and Computer Technology” (Class X-CBSE).

11. The law in regard to restriction on Court’s interference in evaluation of answers of an examination has been laid down by Hon’ble Supreme Court in catena of judgements. Reliance has been placed upon ***Ran Vijay Singh v. State of U.P., (2018) 2 SCC 357***, wherein it was held as under:-

“30. The law on the subject is therefore, quite clear and we only propose to highlight a few significant conclusions. They are:

xxxxxxx

30.3. The court should not at all re-evaluate or scrutinise the answer sheets of a candidate—it has no expertise in the matter and academic matters are best left to academics;

30.4. The court should presume the correctness of the key answers and proceed on that assumption; and



30.5. In the event of a doubt, the benefit should go to the examination authority rather than to the candidate.

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. ...”

12. A perusal of the judgment shows that the scope Courts’ interfere to re-evaluate or scrutinise answer sheet is limited to rare and exceptional cases, only when there is material error and an entire examination process cannot be obstructed, only because some candidates are dissatisfied and allege erroneous question or answer.

13. In the present case, once the subject expert has opined on the correctness of the answer, this Court in a writ jurisdiction cannot re-evaluate and substitute its own opinion for that of the subject expert.

14. Even though, I have sympathy with the petitioner, but within the framework of law this Court cannot entertain the contentions of the petitioner or delve into the report published by Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineering (IEEE) and book namely “PC Hardware in a Nutshell”, relied upon by the petitioner to urge that Motherboard is the heart of the computer, as the same would lead to evaluation of the correctness of the opinion of the subject expert.

15. For the said reason, the present petition is dismissed.



16. Consequently, pending applications, if any, are also disposed of.

JASMEET SINGH, J

MARCH 19, 2026/AS