2026:AHC:209698

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 16536 of 2026

Archana Verma

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Shivanand Mishra, Vijay Shankar Shukla
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Udayan Nandan

Court No. - 6

HON'BLE VINOD DIWAKAR, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel for the State.

2. The present petition has been filed seeking direction in the nature of certiorari setting aside the order dated 16.09.2026, passed by the respondent no.2, so far as it concerns the category no.1 i.e. incorrect filling of the OMR Sheet by the candidates.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, who is working as Shiksha Mitra, appeared in the UPTET-2026 pursuant to Advertisement No. 01/UP TET/2026 issued by the U.P. Education Service Selection Commission, Prayagraj. She appeared in the examination held on 03.07.2026. It is submitted that while filling the OMR answer sheet, the petitioner correctly wrote the question booklet number 133312689 in the boxes provided in Column No. 3. However, while shading the corresponding circles, she inadvertently left the circle for digit "2" unshaded. The petitioner informed the respondent no. 2 about this mistake through her application dated 16.07.2026 and requested that her answer sheet be considered for evaluation.

4. Learned counsel further submits that when the result was declared on 26.08.2026, the petitioner's result was shown as "Rejected" on the ground that an invalid question booklet number had been entered. It is submitted that the mistake was only in shading one circle, whereas the correct booklet number was clearly written in the boxes. The petitioner has secured 85 marks as per the answer key, against the qualifying marks of 82. Therefore,

it is prayed that the impugned order dated 16.09.2026 be set aside and the petitioner's answer sheet be considered for evaluation in accordance with law.

5. Shri Udayan Nandan, learned counsel for respondent no. 2, relies upon the notification dated 16.09.2026 issued by the Uttar Pradesh Education Service Selection Commission, which provides that an OMR sheet shall not be evaluated if the serial number or question booklet number is left blank or filled incorrectly, the responsibility for which lies upon the candidate.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel appearing for the respondent Commission, and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the notification dated 16.09.2026 issued by the Uttar Pradesh Education Service Selection Commission specifically provides that an OMR answer sheet shall not be evaluated where the serial number or question booklet number has been left blank or has been incorrectly filled, the responsibility for making the correct entries being that of the candidate. The requirement to correctly fill and shade the serial number and question booklet number is a part of the prescribed examination procedure and applies uniformly to all candidates. In the absence of any material showing that the petitioner's case falls within any permissible exception under the applicable instructions, the incorrect entry cannot be treated as a mere inadvertent or curable human error so as to require evaluation of the OMR answer sheet contrary to the prescribed instructions.

7. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, and having regard to the specific instructions governing the filling up and evaluation of the OMR answer sheet, this Court finds no illegality or infirmity in the decision dated 16.09.2026 taken by the respondent Commission warranting interference in exercise of writ jurisdiction.

8. The writ petition is, accordingly, ***dismissed***.

October 7, 2026
A. Tripathi

(Vinod Diwakar,J.)

Digitally signed by :-
AKHILESH TRIPATHI
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad