

(2025) 01 KL CK 1692

In the High Court Of Kerala

Case No : Writ Petition (C) No. 46402 Of 2024

Ishani S Nair

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Kerala

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 03-01-2025

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2025) 01 KL CK 1692

Hon'ble Judges : C. Jayachandran, J

Bench : Single Bench

**Advocate : T.D.Susmith Kumar, Jaykar.K.S., Vandana A., Anjali R. Menon,
C.Sivadas, Surya Binoy**

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

C. Jayachandran, J

1. The petitioner had participated in Mohiniyattam (Girls H.S.) in the Kozhikode District Kalolsavam 2024-2025. Though the petitioner fared well, she could secure only the sixth position. The specific ground raised by the petitioner is the corrections made in the Score Sheet by the one among the panel judges by name, Jisha Gopinath. This, according to the petitioner, is a modus of manipulation. These corrections are evident from Ext.P1 & Ext.P2 Score Sheets. Another contention raised is that the petitioner's result was initially declared as second with 'grade A', which was later downgraded to seventh, with 'grade A'. On these premise, the petitioner seeks interference from this Court.

2. The above submissions are seriously opposed by the learned Government Pleader, pointing out that the corrections as available in Exts.P1 and P2 at running pages 30 and 38, are genuine and not tainted by any mala fide motives. Insofar as Ext.P1 is concerned, Code no.50 is repeated twice, which is only corrected by Code no.49, with the marks obtained by the candidate corresponding to Code no.49. The same is the case with respect to Code no.36, wherein the marks obtained by Code no.37 was inadvertently entered into. This

was corrected by the Judge. As against both corrections, the judge has countersigned, as required by the Manual of Kalolsavam. It was specifically pointed out by the learned Government Pleader that the marks obtained by the petitioner is 12 marks less than the marks obtained by the first prize holder.

3. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the respective parties, this Court finds little merit in the instant Writ Petition. As rightly pointed out by the learned Government Pleader, no inference of any manipulation can be made only for reason of the corrections made in Exts.P1 and P2, at running pages 30 and 38, respectively. Insofar as Ext.P1 is concerned, it is axiomatic that the Code no.50 is repeated, instead of incorporating the marks obtained by the candidate as against Code no.49. This is seen corrected in Ext.P1. Similarly, in Ext.P2 at running page no.38, the marks obtained by Code no.37 is seen stated as such, as against Code no.36, which is also seen corrected. As against the corrections, the judge concerned has countersigned, as required by the Manual of Kalolsavam. This Court cannot find any manipulation as suggested by the petitioner from the above conduct. Moreover, the difference in marks between the petitioner and the candidate who obtained the first position is 12. It is clear that the person who obtained the first position alone will be entitled to compete in the State Kalolsavam as against the respective event.

In the circumstances, this Writ Petition lacks merit, and the same will stand dismissed.