

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

L.P.A. No. 211 of 2026

Asgari Khatoon aged about 45 Years W/O Ahad Faras, Resident of Village - Pharkesh, Pabeya P.O.- Pabeya P.S.-Bharno, District - Gumla (Jharkhand). ... Appellant

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through its Chief Secretary, Government of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, P.O. & P.S.-Dhurwa, District Ranchi (Jharkhand).
2. The Commissioner, South Chhotanagpur, Division, Ranchi, P.O.- Ranchi GPO, P.S.- Kotwali, District-Ranchi (Jharkhand).
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.-Ranchi GPO, P.S.- Kotwali, District-Ranchi (Jharkhand).
4. Director Welfare, South Chhotanagpur Division, Ranchi, P.O.- Ranchi GPO, P.S. Kotwali, District-Ranchi (Jharkhand).
5. District Social Welfare Officer, Gumla, at Gumla P.O. & P.S.-Gumla District Gumla (Jharkhand).
6. Hasan Ara, wife of Ershad Ahmad, resident of Village-Sargaon, P.O.-Datiya, P.S.-Bharno, District-Gumla (Jharkhand).

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR**

For the Appellant: Mr. Kripa Shankar Nanda, Advocate
For the State: Mr. Rakesh Kr. Shahi, A.C. to S.C. (L&C)-I

02/Dated: 20.04.2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. This appeal challenges the learned Single Judge's order dated 15.01.2026 dismissing the appellant's W.P.(S) No. 7728 of 2025. The appellant had in fact prayed for re-evaluation of her answer-sheets.
3. The learned Single Judge, relying on **Ran Vijay Singh Vs. State of U.P., (2018) 2 SCC 357** held that if there is no statute rule or regulation permitting re-evaluation or scrutiny of an answer sheet then the court may permit such re-evaluation or scrutiny only if it is demonstrated very clearly, without any inferential process of reasoning or by a process of rationalization and that too only in rare or exceptional cases where

material error has been committed. This decision also holds that a Court should not at all re-evaluate or scrutinise the answer sheets of a candidate, as it has no expertise in this matter and academic matters are best left to the academics. Further, in the event of a doubt, the benefit should go to the examination authority rather than to the candidate.

4. In this case, there is no rule, regulation or statute permitting re-evaluation. Still, at the insistence of the appellant and in order that the Court's conscience is satisfied, the learned Single Judge, called the tabulation chart and O.M.R. marksheets. The Court found that the petitioner's papers were evaluated twice and on both these occasions, in Paper - 1, the petitioner was found to have secured 70 marks and in Paper-II, 76 marks. Thus, the learned Single Judge concluded that there was no discrepancy or material error.

5. Now, the learned counsel for the appellant states that the answer should have been compared with the answer keys and this was not done. This contention is incorrect. In any event, the appellant's entire claim was for re-evaluation because according to her, she should have got 86 marks in Paper-II. No case is made out by the petitioner for grant of any such indulgence. There is no error in the view taken by the learned Single Judge in this matter. Accordingly, this Letters Patent Appeal is dismissed. No costs.

(M.S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

April 20, 2026

N.A.F.R.

APK/VK

Uploaded on 22.04.2026