
(2014) 05 MP CK 0060
In the Madhya Pradesh High Court
Case No : W.P. No. 4685/2014

Deshraj Ahirwar

APPELLANT

Vs

Dr. Hari Singh Gour University and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 05-05-2014

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2014) 05 MP CK 0060

Hon'ble Judges : Rajendra Menon, J; Anil Kumar Sharma, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : L.S. Singh, Learned Sr. Advocate and Shri J.L. Soni, Learned Counsel, Advocate for the Appellant; Sobha Menon, Learned Sr. Advocate and Shri C.A. Thomas, Learned Counsel for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2, Advocate for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

1. Petitioner was a student who had appeared in the B.Ed. Main Examination conducted in the March-April, 2012. It is the grievance of the petitioner that in the subject of Teacher In Emerging Indian Society, petitioner has obtained 22 marks out of 80 marks. Contending that petitioner has done very well in the said paper and should have received more marks, an application was submitted. The same was also undertaken and, thereafter when result as "No Change" was communicated to the petitioner, this writ petition has been filed.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that there is some mistake in valuing the answer sheet and prayer made is that the answer sheet be recalled and direction issued for revaluing the same.

3. Respondents on notice have filed a reply indicating that when in revaluation "No Change" was found, the same has been communicated to the petitioner. In support of the same, learned Sr. Counsel invites our attention to the order passed under similar circumstances in W.P. No. 16477/2010 (Meenakshi Sahu Vs. The State of MP) and submits that on the grounds raised in this writ petition, no

further direction are to be issued.

4. We have heard rival contentions advanced by learned counsel for the parties. Petitioner has only made vague allegation to say that as answer sheet has not been valued properly and except for contending the aforesaid, prima-facie no material is adduced by the petitioner to say as to what is the error in valuation and revaluation done by the University and as to why revaluation ordered by the University should not be accepted. Merely on the basis of vague allegation, no direction can be issued by this Court, particularly when the petitioner has a right to get the answer sheet under the Right to Information Act and get it revalued. No such exercise has been undertaken by the petitioner, therefore, in this writ petition, based on the same, we see no reason to interfere into the matter.

5. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.