



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND

REVIEW PETITION No. 280 OF 2025

IN

WRIT PETITION No.5241/2022 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

1. NAGARAJ DURAGANNAVAR,
S/O VENKAPPA DURAGANNAVAR,
AGE 32 YEARS,
R/O HOUSE No.284,
DURGADEVI COLONY,
WARD No.18, GOKAK DISTRICT,
BELAGAVI- 591307.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI MADANGOUDA NARASAGOUDA PATIL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
(PRE-UNIVERSITY EDUCATION),
M. S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU-560001.
2. THE DIRECTOR,
PRE-UNIVERSITY EDUCATION BOARD,
SAMPIGE ROAD, 18TH CROSS,





MALLESHWARAM,
BENGALURU-560012.

3. THE KARNATAKA EXAMINATIONS
AUTHORITY,
REPRESENTED BY ITS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
SAMPIGE ROAD, 18TH CROSS,
MALLESHWARAM,
BENGALURU-560012.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI VIKAS ROJIPURA, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SRI N.K. RAMESH, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS REVIEW PETITION IS FILED UNDER ORDER 47 RULE 1 R/W SECTION 114 OF CPC, PRAYING TO REVIEW THE JUDGMENT/ORDER DATED 15.04.2025 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT IN WRIT PETITION No.5241/2022 (S-KAT) VIDE ANNEXURE- A AND ALLOWED THE WRIT PETITION AS PRAYED FOR, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR FURTHER ORDERS THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT)

This review petition is filed under Order XLVII Rule 1 of CPC seeking review of order dated 15.04.2025 in Writ Petition No.5241/2022 passed by this Court rejecting the writ petition, whereunder the petitioner had questioned the order dated 16.11.2021 in Application No.6363/2019 passed by the



Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal (for short 'the Tribunal').

2. Heard learned counsel Sri.Madanagouda Narasagouda Patil for the petitioner, learned Additional Government Advocate Sri. Vikas Rojipura for respondent Nos.1 and 2 and learned counsel Sri.N.K. Ramesh for respondent No.3.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the Tribunal as well as this Court in the orders under review have wrongly come to the conclusion that the negative marking of quarter marks would be quarter of 1 mark. However, he submits that quarter mark would mean that 0.25% of the marks prescribed for the answer.

4. We have gone through the Cadre and Recruitment Rules, which reads as "quarter mark shall be deducted for each wrong answer".

5. The above would mean that whatever the marks allotted for each question, quarter mark would be deducted as negative mark for wrong answer. This Court has rightly come to



the above said conclusion in its order under review. The petitioner has not pointed out any error apparent on the face of the record to review the said order.

6. Accordingly, the review petition stands rejected.

**Sd/-
(S.G.PANDIT)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(K. V. ARAVIND)
JUDGE**

VBS
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 16