

(2025) 07 KL CK 1194
In the High Court Of Kerala
Case No : Writ Appeal No. 1699 OF 2025

State Of Kerala

APPELLANT

Vs

Garry Vino George

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-07-2025

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 14
Kerala High Court Act, 1958 — Section 5(i)

Citation : (2025) 07 KL CK 1194

Hon'ble Judges : Anil K.Narendran, J;Muralee Krishna S., J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : K. Gopalakrishna Kurup, N.Manoj Kumar, P.G. Pramod, Kurian George Kannanthanam, Tony George Kannanthanam, Thomas George, Ebee Antony, Aith George Koola

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Anil K. Narendran, J.

1. W.A.Nos.1699, 1700, 1701 and 1702 of 2025 filed by the State of Kerala and others under Section 5(i) of the Kerala High Court Act, 1958 arise out of a common judgment dated 09.07.2025 of the learned Single Judge in W.P. (C)Nos.24976, 24951, 25180 and 24767 of 2025. The said writ petitions were filed by the respondent(s) in W.A.Nos.1699, 1700 and 1701 of 2025 and respondents 1 and 2 in W.A.No.1702 of 2025. Respondents 3 and 4 in W.A.No.1702 of 2025 are additional respondents 3 and 4 in W.P.(C)No.24767 of 2025.

2. The petitioners in those writ petitions are students who have completed 12th Standard education from the CBSE stream of syllabus. For pursuing professional degree courses in Engineering, they submitted online applications in response to the Prospectus for Admission to Professional Degree Courses-2025 (for brevity, 'Prospectus-2025') issued by the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations, Kerala (for brevity, 'CEE, Kerala'). They appeared for the entrance

examination KEAM-2025 for Engineering courses, held from 22.04.2025 to 30.04.2025. Additional respondents 3 and 4 in W.P.(C)No.24767 of 2025, who are respondents 3 and 4 in W.A.No.1702 of 2025, are students who have completed 12th Standard education in Kerala Higher Secondary stream.

3. The common challenge in the writ petitions was against G.O. (Ms.)No.470/2025/HEDN dated 01.07.2025 issued by the State of Kerala, whereby the standardization formula in the Prospectus for Admission to Professional Degree Courses-2025 was changed by the State. The said order is one issued invoking the provisions under Clause 1.6 of the Prospectus-2025, which was approved by the Government vide G.O.(Ms.)No.97/ 2025/HEDN dated 19.02.2025, on the ground that there exists a disparity while standardising the marks of those students who completed 12th Standard education in Kerala Higher Secondary stream and other streams, including CBSE. Other consequential reliefs were also sought for in the writ petitions.

4. In W.P.(C)No.24951 of 2025, the 2nd respondent Commissioner for Entrance Examinations, Kerala, has filed a counter affidavit dated 08.07.2025, opposing the reliefs sought for, producing therewith Ext.R2(a) calculation statement of standardised marks in respect of the writ petitioners, who are CBSE students and those candidates with identical marks in the Kerala Higher Secondary stream, using the earlier method and new method of standardization. In W.P. (C)No.24767 of 2025 also, the 2nd respondent Commissioner for Entrance Examinations has filed a counter affidavit dated 07.07.2025.

5. After considering the rival contentions, the learned Single Judge, by the impugned judgment dated 09.07.2025, disposed of the writ petitions subject to the observations and directions contained therein. The learned Single Judge found that after the conduct of the entrance examination, the Government is denuded of its power, even under Clause 1.6 of the Prospectus-2025, to change the prospectus. Rules of the game cannot be changed midway, once the game has begun. Prima facie, it appears that somebody looked at the results and found that students from the Kerala stream have not done fairly good. To satisfy the constituency, such a mala fide decision has been taken, in an arbitrary manner, to change the Prospectus on 01.07.2025, one hour before the publication of the result. Such an exercise of power is wholly arbitrary, illegal, unjustified and cannot be countenanced on any ground. The learned Single Judge noticed that though the learned Senior Government Pleader has vehemently supported the decision of the Government, he has no answer for the manner in which the Prospectus was changed on 01.07.2025, one hour before the rank list was published. Therefore, the learned Single Judge held that the change in the Prospectus, one hour before the publication of the rank list after the examination, is wholly unjustified, illegal and arbitrary. In the impugned judgment, the learned Single Judge set aside the change in the Prospectus and the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations, Kerala, is directed to publish the rank list in accordance with the Prospectus, which was issued on 19.02.2025.

6. Challenging the common judgment dated 09.07.2025 of the learned Single Judge in W.P.(C)N.24767 of 2025 and connected matters, the State of Kerala and the official respondents are before this Court in W.A.Nos.1699, 1700, 1701 and 1702 of 2025.

7. The connected writ petition, i.e., W.P.(C)No.25230 of 2025, is listed before the Division Bench based on the order passed today (10.07.2025) by the learned Single Judge. Considering the urgency, the Registry has placed the matter before the Division Bench, as directed by Registrar (Judicial), subject to ratification by the Hon'ble the Chief Justice. The said writ petition is one filed by two students who have completed 12th Standard education from the CBSE stream of syllabus, challenging G.O.(Ms.)No.470/2025/HEDN dated 01.07.2025 issued by the State of Kerala and for other consequential reliefs.

8. The writ appeals are moved as 'today motion'. We heard detailed arguments of the learned Advocate General for the State and its officials, the appellants in W.A.Nos.1699, 1700, 1701 and 1702 of 2025, the learned Senior Counsel for the respondents-petitioners in W.A.No.1699 of 2025, the learned counsel for the respondents-petitioners in W.A.No.1700 of 2025, the learned counsel for the respondent-petitioner in W.A.No.1701 of 2025, the learned counsel for respondents 1 and 2-petitioners in W.A.No.1702 of 2025, the learned counsel for respondents 3 and 4 in W.A.No.1702 of 2025 (who are additional respondents 3 and 4 in W.P.(C)No.24767 of 2025) and also the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners in W.P.(C)No.25230 of 2025.

9. The learned Advocate General would submit that the Government have ample power under Clause 1.6 of the Prospectus-2025 to modify or replace the formula for standardization of the marks obtained by the students in the qualifying examinations and draw the rank list based on the modified formula. The Government appointed an expert committee to review the standardization formula leading to the preparation of the rank list, when found necessary. The Government, on examining the available materials, found it proper to amend the Prospectus-2025 and prepared the rank list on the basis of the amended provisions. On account of the amendment, no group of students is placed in a disadvantageous position, as the amendment was for removing disparity. There is no violation of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. The standardization formula and its modification fall within the domain of the State Government and its expertise regarding the modalities and intricacies involved in the standardization of the marks. The modification of the standardization formula would not amount to change of the rules of the game midway. The findings to the contra in the judgment of the learned Single Judge are per se arbitrary and patently illegal, which warrants interference in these writ appeals. The learned Advocate General would place reliance on the Division Bench decisions of this Court in *Dr.Vinod K.M. and others v. State of Kerala and others* [2012 (2) KHC 797], *Sreeja S. and others v. State of Kerala and others* [2013 (1) KHC 230] and *Seema Sebastain v. State of Kerala* [2023 (3) KHC 284]. The learned Advocate

General would also place reliance on the decisions of the Apex Court in *Rachit Sinha v. Union of India* [AIR 2018 SC 2153] and *Tej Prakash Pathak v. Rajasthan High Court* [(2025) 2 SCC 1].

10. On the other hand, the learned Senior Counsel for the respondents-petitioners in W.A.No.1699 of 2025, the learned Counsel for the respondents-petitioners in W.A.No.1700 of 2025, the learned counsel for the respondent-petitioner in W.A.No.1701 of 2025 and the learned counsel for the respondents 1 and 2-petitioners in W.A.No.1702 of 2025 would contend that Clause 1.6 of the Prospectus-2025 does not enable the Government to modify the formula for standardization of the marks obtained by the students in the qualifying examinations in the midway, since it would amount to change of the rules of the game midway, as rightly found by the learned Single Judge. The decision taken by the Government, vide the order dated 01.07.2025, to modify the formula of standardization is vitiated by malafides, which has been taken one hour before the publication of the result of the entrance examination. The learned Single Judge rightly found that such an exercise of power by the State Government is wholly arbitrary, illegal, unjustified and cannot be countenanced on any ground. They would place reliance on the decision of the Apex Court in *Tej Prakash Pathak v. Rajasthan High Court* [(2025) 2 SCC 1]. They would also place reliance on the decisions of this Court in *Dr.Vinod K.M. and others v. State of Kerala and others* [2012 (2) KHC 797] and *Jumni Nasry v. State of Kerala and others* [2024:KER:20723]. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners in W.P.(C)No.25230 of 2025 adopted the very same arguments.

11. The learned counsel for respondents 3 and 4 in W.A.No.1702 of 2025 (who are additional respondents 3 and 4 in W.P.(C)No.24767 of 2025) would adopt the arguments of the learned Advocate General. The learned counsel would point out that the modification of the formula of standardization necessitated since there exists a disparity while standardising the marks of those students who completed 12th Standard education in Kerala Higher Secondary stream and other streams, including CBSE.

12. Since the report dated 02.06.2025 of the Standardization Review Committee constituted by the State Government and the report dated 05.06.2025 of the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations, which are referred to in the Government order dated 01.07.2025, are not part of the pleadings, the learned Advocate General was directed to make available for the perusal of this Court copy of those reports. As instructed by the learned Advocate General, the learned Senior Government Pleader obtained copy of the said reports, which are made available for the perusal of this Court. Copy of the said reports were provided to the learned Senior Counsel/learned counsel for the respondents in the writ appeals and also to the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners in W.P.(C)No.25230 of 2025.

13. From the pleadings and materials on record and also the submissions made at the Bar, we notice that the Prospectus-2025 was approved by the Government

vide G.O.(Ms.)No.97/ 2025/HEDN dated 19.02.2025. Based on the said prospectus the writ petitioners and others submitted online application for the entrance examination KEAM-2025 for admission to Engineering degree courses. The last date of submission of the application was 10.03.2025. The entrance examination for Engineering degree courses were held from 23.04.2025 to 29.04.2025, on different dates.

14. Clause 1.4(a) of the Prospectus-2025 provides that the admission to Engineering courses shall be regulated on the basis of merit as assessed by giving equal weightage of 50:50 to the normalised score obtained in the entrance examination for Engineering and the grade/marks obtained in Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry put together in the final year of the qualifying examination, after effecting the standardization procedure as described in Clause 9.7.4(b), for computing the index mark out of 600. In case the candidate has not studied Chemistry, the marks obtained in Computer Science shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry and Computer Science, the marks obtained in Biotechnology shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, Computer Science and Biotechnology, the marks obtained in Biology shall be considered. The marks as shown in the mark list obtained from the Board of Examination of respective Higher Secondary Board shall be considered for academic eligibility.

15. Clause 1.6 of the Prospectus-2025 provides that the prospectus is subject to modification/addition/deletion, as may be deemed necessary by the Government.

16. Clause 9.7.4(b) of the Prospectus-2025 deals with rank list for Engineering courses. Clause 9.7.4(b) reads thus;

"9.7.4 Preparation of Rank Lists:

(a) xxx xxx xxx

(b) Rank list for Engineering courses

(i) Equal weightage of 50:50 shall be given to the normalized score obtained in the Entrance Examination for Engineering as described in Clause 9.4.4(i) and the grade/marks obtained in the final year of the qualifying examination for Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry put together, after effecting the standardization procedure as described in Clause 9.7.4(b)(iii). In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, the marks obtained in Computer Science shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry and Computer Science, the marks obtained in Biotechnology shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, Computer Science and Biotechnology, the marks obtained in Biology shall be considered.

(ii) The final year marks of the qualifying examination of each subject Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry/ Computer Science/Biotechnology/ Biology of the students who have passed the subject, received from the respective Boards, shall be transformed out of 100. The marks of the three subjects shall be

computed out of 300 after effecting standardization in each subject.

(iii) The formula for standardization as has been approved by the Expert Committee constituted vide G.O.(Rt)No. 1758/2011/H.Edn. dated.03.11.2011: The marks secured by a student in the qualifying examination from any Board will be standardized with respect to the statistical parameters such as Global Mean and Global Standard Deviation. The standardized mark YBG of a candidate of the stream (B) standardized with respect to the global reference stream (G) for the subject is

$$YBG = MG + SG [X_{Bj} - MB_j]$$

SB_j

Where MB_j and SB_j denote respectively the Mean and Standard Deviation of the marks out of 100 of all students who have passed in a subject of the final year of qualifying examination of any stream (B) of the year j and X_{Bj} is the mark of a candidate out of 100 for the subject in the stream (B) of the year j. The Global Mean (MG) of a subject is the combined average of the marks of that subject out of hundred of all students who have passed in that subject (Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry/Computer Science/ Biotechnology/Biology as the case may be), of the final year of the Qualifying Examination of Kerala HSE, Kerala VHSE, CBSE and CISCE Boards taken together for the period from 2009 to 2025. The Global Standard Deviation (SG) of the subject is the combined standard deviation of marks of that subject out of hundred of all students who have passed in that subject (Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry/Computer Science/ Biotechnology/ Biology as the case may be), of the final year of the Qualifying Examination of Kerala HSE, Kerala VHSE, CBSE and CISCE Boards taken together for the period from 2009 to 2025.

(iv) The subjects of the qualifying examination considered for the computation of marks for the purpose of ranking shall be Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry. The marks of the concerned subject out of hundred or an equivalent mark out of hundred, as given in the final year mark list of the Qualifying Examination of any plus two stream shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, the marks obtained in Computer Science shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry and Computer Science, the marks obtained in Biotechnology shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, Computer Science and Biotechnology, the marks obtained in Biology shall be considered.

(v) Standardization of the marks of the subjects as per the clauses 9.7.4(b)(iii)&(iv) will be effected under the supervision of the Authority concerned. The standardized mark YBG shall be taken as it is obtained from the formula given in clause 9.7.4(b)(iii). The sum of the standardized marks of three subjects Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry/Computer Science/Biotechnology/ Biology as the case may be, shall be limited to three hundred.

(vi) The normalized score obtained by the candidate in the Engineering Entrance Examination shall be computed out of 300, and added to the total standardized marks of Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry/Computer Science/ Biotechnology/ Biology as the case may be, of the final year of the Qualifying Examination, computed out of 300, both corrected to four places of decimals. The rank list for Engineering Courses shall be prepared based on the total marks obtained out of an Index mark of 600, computed as above.

(vii) If any Board/Authority provides results by letter grades/CGPA/ OGPA, etc., the candidate concerned shall have to submit the marks equivalent as required, from the Board/Authority concerned, failing which the decision on standardization of marks shall be taken based on the available information by the Committee of Statisticians constituted vide G.O.(Rt)No.1061/2017/H.EDN dated 07.06.2017, which shall be final and binding on the applicant.

(viii) If any Board/Authority fails to provide data required for the process of standardization for any year, the mean and standard deviation available for the nearest year after the year of passing of the candidate for the concerned Board/ Authority shall be considered for standardization of marks and such decision shall be final and binding on the applicant.

(ix) If any Board/Authority fails to provide data requested and required for the process of standardization and the data for the nearest years after the year of passing of the candidate are also not available, then the mean and standard deviation of CBSE for the respective years, or in the absence of such information from CBSE, the mean and standard deviation of CBSE available for the nearest year after the year of passing of the candidate shall be considered for standardization of marks and such decision shall be final and binding on the applicant.

17. As already noticed hereinbefore, the issue raised in these writ appeals and the connected writ petition centres around a Government order dated 01.07.2025, which is marked as Ext.P12 in W.P.(C)No.24951 of 2025, whereby the standardization formula in the Prospectus-2025, was changed by the State, invoking the provisions under Clause 1.6 of the Prospectus-2025, on the ground that there exists a disparity while standardising the marks of those students who completed 12th Standard education in Kerala Higher Secondary stream and other streams, including CBSE. As evident from Clause 9.7.4(b)(iii) of the Prospectus-2025, the said standardization formula was one approved by the Expert Committee constituted vide G.O.(Rt)No. 1758/2011/H.Edn. dated 03.11.2011.

18. It is not in dispute that the request of the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations for modification of the standardization formula was one made before the Government on 03.11.2024. It is thereafter that the Government vide G.O.(Ms.)No.97/2025/HEDN dated 19.02.2025 approved the Prospectus-2025.

19. The relevant extract of the report dated 02.06.2025 submitted by the

Standardization Review Committee before the Government is extracted hereunder;

"After the first meeting of the Standardization Review Committee, sample data derived from the mark data of KEAM Engineering applicants from 2012 to 2024 provided as per the Committee's request was used to examine four different types of formulas. Based on the preliminary observations, the method that uses statistical parameters such as Overall Range, Group Minimum, and Group Range, Group Minimum was considered by the committee members to be the most appropriate. However, the committee members opined that implementing the new method this year would not be scientifically appropriate, as a more comprehensive study is required to make an authoritative comparison with the current method. It was also noted that the formula was tested using only a very limited sample and that the parameters used in the formula were derived from that sample itself. Therefore, the committee concluded that a decision can only be made after standardizing the Plus Two marks of applicants both qualified and nonqualified from various boards across different subjects for the past 10 years, applying the new formula to this complete dataset, and comparing it with the existing method. Since the software currently used for the existing method is available at the CEE office, the committee members suggested that the CEE office would be the most convenient for testing the new formula. However, it was clarified by the Joint Commissioner (Computer) that the available software is designed to work after the standardization is done using the required parameters, and that the derivation of those parameters is the responsibility of the currently appointed Standardization Committee by the Government.

Although calculating standardized marks using the formula is a relatively straightforward task, deriving the required parameters demands expert input. Therefore, the committee members informed that a detailed report on the new formula and its associated parameters would be submitted shortly. The third meeting of the Standardization Review Committee, chaired by the Honourable Commissioner for Entrance Examinations, was held online on Monday, May 26, 2025.

Using the Plus Two examination marks received from Kerala Higher Secondary, CBSE, and CISC boards for the period from 2011 to 2024, the marks for these years were standardized using the new method as suggested by the Standardization Review Committee.

The results obtained through this new standardization process, as well as those obtained using the current method, were presented to the committee. Following the examination of this data, the findings were discussed in detail, and the committee reviewed the key differences between the current method and the proposed new method one by one. It was opined that the new method exhibits greater outlier sensitivity, and therefore, precise and scientifically sound provisions must be established to appropriately handle both the lowest and highest marks. Although the average difference between the marks before and

after standardization appears to be lower in the new method compared to the existing method which at first glance seems more acceptable the committee opined that more authoritative studies and validations are necessary before this can be accepted as a definitive advantage. The Commissioner for Entrance Examinations requested the committee members to also examine the methods followed in states like Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, and Telangana, and to present, in the next meeting, an assessment of the applicability of those methods in the context of Kerala.

The committee members concluded that it would be appropriate to maintain the status quo until the advantages of the new method are proven with authoritative evidence. The committee members also stated that a more detailed and authoritative analysis would be prepared and presented at the next meeting.

The fourth meeting of the Standard Review Committee, chaired by the Honourable Commissioner for Entrance Examinations, was held online on Friday, May 30, 2025. The committee reviewed the topics discussed in the previous meetings. In the context of preparing the rank list for admission to engineering professional courses, a proposal was discussed to revise the existing 50:50 weightage ratio currently applied between the normalised entrance examination marks and the total marks/grades obtained in the qualifying examination (final year) in Mathematics, Physics, and Chemistry to a new ratio of 60:40 (Entrance score: 60, Qualifying score: 40). This proposal was agreed upon by three members, while one member, Mr. Sivakumar, expressed dissent. Currently, data from the past 10 years is considered for calculating the global mean. However, it was decided that data from the past five years of various boards could also be considered, and that the impact of using five year data instead of ten should be studied in detail. Number of years should be reduced for overall mean and s. d. calculation. The committee recommended that giving initial scores may be considered for students studying under the Kerala syllabus. It was also suggested that the committee constituted as per Government Order G.O. (Rt)No.586/ 2025/HEDN dated 14.05.2025 should study this matter further and adding the raw Plus Two marks directly to the entrance exam marks, as done in some other states, is not scientifically appropriate.

The committee opined that introducing a new formula or making any modifications to the existing one would only be possible after thorough and detailed studies. It must also be ensured that any new formula is demonstrably better than the current one. As it needs more time, the committee concluded that implementing a new formula this year is not feasible.

However, the committee recommended that in the present year, the number of years should be reduced to 5 years for the calculation of overall mean and standard deviation. The committee suggested to revise the existing 50:50 weightage ratio currently applied between the normalised entrance examination marks and the standardized total marks/grades obtained in the qualifying examination (final year) to a new ratio of 60:40 (Entrance score: 60, Qualifying

score: 40).

The committee recommended that giving initial scores may be considered for students studying under the Kerala syllabus.”

20. The Commissioner for Entrance Examinations, vide report dated 05.06.2025, submitted his recommendations before the Government, suggesting five options, enclosing therewith the report dated 02.06.2025 of the Standardization Review Committee. Thereafter, the Government order dated 01.07.2025 has been issued, whereby the Government amended the Prospectus-2025, as stated in that order. English translation of the Government order dated 01.07.2025 reads thus;

“Vide order 1st cited above, the Government approved the prospectus for KEAM, 2025. As per Clause 1.6 of KEAM 2025 prospectus, the Government has the power to make necessary modifications in the prospectus.

2. Government by order 2nd cited above constituted a Standardization Review Committee to conduct study on the method and formula currently used to calculate standardized/normalised marks of the qualifying examination for KEAM engineering entrance and to suggest recommendations for making amendments in the prospectus. The said Committee submitted its report as per reference (4).

3. Government had examined the recommendations in the report submitted by the Standardization Review Committee as per reference (4) and the suggestions of the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations in the reports submitted as per reference (3) and (5).

4. Government had examined the issue regarding amendment of KEAM, 2025 prospectus in detail. In order to arrive at a suitable formula for preparing the rank list for KEAM, 2025 Entrance Examination, it is hereby ordered to amend the prospectus to standardize/normalise the Plus-Two (Class XII) Board marks as per the formula mentioned in the Annexure and by adding the marks of Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry in the ratio of 5:3:2, while maintaining existing 50:50 ratio for the entrance examination marks and marks in the Plus Two (Class XII) Board.

5. The amendments made to the prospectus, approved as per order 1st cited above, are appended to this order.”

21. The amendments made to the Prospectus-2025, vide the Government order dated 01.07.2025, are shown in the annexure to the said order, in a tabular form. The amendment made to Clause 1.4(a) of the Prospectus, 2025 reads thus;

“1.4(a) Admission to Engineering courses shall be regulated on the basis of merit as assessed by giving equal weightage of 50:50 to the normalized score obtained in the Entrance Examination for Engineering and the grade/marks obtained in the final year of the qualifying examination for Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry put together in the ratio 5:3:2, after effecting the normalization procedure as

described in Clause 9.7.4(b), for computing the Index mark out of 600. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, the marks obtained in Computer Science shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry and Computer Science, the marks obtained in Biotechnology shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, Computer Science and Biotechnology, the marks obtained in Biology shall be considered. The marks as shown in the mark list obtained from the Board of Examination of respective Higher Secondary Board shall be considered for academic eligibility.”

22. The amendment made to Clause 9.7.4(b)(i) of the Prospectus, 2025 reads thus;

“(i) Equal weightage of 50:50 shall be given to the normalized score obtained in the Entrance Examination for Engineering as described in Clause 9.4.4(i) and the grade/marks obtained in the final year of the qualifying examination for Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry put together, in the ratio 5:3:2, after effecting the normalization procedure as described in Clause 9.7.4(b)(iii). In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, the marks obtained in Computer Science shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry and Computer Science, the marks obtained in Biotechnology shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, Computer Science and Biotechnology, the marks obtained in Biology shall be considered.”

23. The amendment made to Clause 9.7.4(b)(ii) of the Prospectus, 2025 reads thus;

“(ii) The final year marks of the qualifying examination of each subject Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry/ Computer Science/Biotechnology/Biology, shall be transformed to be out of 100. The marks of the three subjects, after effecting the normalization in each subject, shall be put together in the ratio 5:3:2 (Mathematics:150, Physics:90, Chemistry:60) so that the combined marks of the three subjects is out of 300.”

24. The amendment made to Clause 9.7.4(b)(iii) of the Prospectus, 2025 reads thus;

“(iii) The marks (out of 100) obtained by the students in the relevant subjects in the qualifying examinations conducted by the various Boards or Authority shall be equated with the marks (out of 100) obtained by the students in the same subjects in the qualifying examination of the current year conducted by the State Board of Kerala by adopting the method of normalization using the following formula.

The normalized mark YB of a candidate of a particular board, B, is:

Where H_jB and H_rK denote respectively the highest marks secured by the students of the board, B, in the year, j, and the highest marks secured by the students of the State Board of Kerala in the current year (2025), and X_jB is the mark of a candidate, out of 100, for the subject in the examination conducted by

the board, B in the year, j.

Qualifying examinations of different years of the same board will be treated as different from each other.

Eg: If the highest mark secured by the students of State Board of Kerala in Mathematics, this year, is 100/100 and the highest mark secured by a student of any other Board in the same subject is 95/100, both the highest marks will be considered to be equal to 100/100. If a student of the other Board secures 70/100 in Mathematics when the highest mark secured in Mathematics in the same Board is 95/100, 70/100 marks will be considered to be equal to 73.68/100 marks as arrived at below.

”

25. By the Government order dated 01.07.2025 amendments were also made to other sub-clauses of Clause 9.7.4(b) in the Prospectus, 2025 and also to Clause 9.7.4(g).

26. A reading of the report dated 02.06.2025 submitted by the Standardization Review Committee, which we have extracted hereinbefore at paragraph 19, would show that after detailed discussions the Committee opined that introducing a new formula or making any modifications to the existing one would only be possible after thorough and detailed studies and it must also be ensured that any new formula is demonstrably better than the current one. Therefore, the recommendation of the Committee in its report dated 02.06.2025 is that implementing a new formula during this year is not feasible as it needs more time. However, the Committee recommended that in the present year, the number of years should be reduced to five years for the calculation of overall mean and standard deviation. The Committee also suggested to revise the existing 50:50 weightage ratio currently applied between the normalised entrance examination marks and the standardized total marks/grades obtained in the qualifying examination (final year) to a new ratio of 60:40, i.e., entrance score:60 and qualifying score:40. The Committee recommended that giving initial scores may be considered for students studying under the Kerala Syllabus.

27. A reading of the amended Clauses of the Prospectus-2025 in the Appendix to the Government order dated 01.07.2025, some of which have been extracted hereinbefore at paragraphs 21 to 24, would make it explicitly clear that the amendment made to the standardization formula in the Prospectus-2025 vide the Government order dated 01.07.2025 are not in tune with the recommendations of the Standardization Review Committee, as contained in its report dated 02.06.2025.

28. After referring to Ext.R2(a) calculation statement of standardized marks produced along with the counter affidavit filed by the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations in W.P.(C)No.24951 of 2025, the learned Advocate General would submit that as per the amended clauses of the Prospectus-2025, all students

belonging to different streams such as Kerala Higher Secondary, CBSE and ICSE are treated equally for the purpose of standardizing the marks obtained in the qualifying examination. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the 1st respondent in W.A.No.1702 of 2025, who is the petitioner in W.P.(C)No.24767 of 2025 would point out Ext.P4 Score Card of KEAM-2025 and Ext.P7 Score Card of another candidate, who secured similar marks for KEAM-2024. According to the learned counsel, the 1st respondent who secured similar marks in KEAM-2025 is now pushed to 2000 ranks below the rank of 1907 secured by the candidate in Ext.P7 Score Card.

29. We are unable to consider the rival contentions on the above aspect in these proceedings, since the materials relied on by the Government to arrive at a decision to modify the standardization formula, which was in force from the year 2011, are not part of the pleadings and materials on record. The said materials are also not discernible either from the report dated 02.06.2025 submitted by the Standardization Review Committee, which consists of the experts appointed by the Government, or the Report dated 05.06.2025 of the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations. Though copy of the above reports is not part of the pleadings and materials on record, the learned Advocate General has made available the same for the perusal of this Court, with copy to the other side. The modified standardization formula provides for adding the marks of Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry in the ratio of 5:3:2, instead of the existing ratio of 1:1:1, while maintaining the existing 50:50 ratio for the entrance examination marks and marks in Plus Two (XII) Board. The Standardization Review Committee has not even suggested or recommended a modified ratio of 5:3:2 for adding the marks of Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry in its report dated 02.06.2025.

30. Now the issue that remains for consideration is as to whether the Government, based on the report of the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations or even the report of the Standardization Review Committee, can modify the standardization formula prescribed in the Prospectus-2025, in the midway, as done vide the Government order dated 01.07.2025.

31. In the impugned judgment, the learned Single Judge found that after the entrance examination was held from 23.04.2025 to 29.04.2025, on different dates, the Government suddenly woke up and amended the prospectus one hour before the publication of the rank list on 01.07.2025. On the above aspect, the learned Advocate General would submit that the Cabinet decision approving the recommendation for modifying the standardization formula prescribed in the Prospectus-2025 was taken on 30.06.2025, vide item No.3082, and it is thereafter that the Government order dated 01.07.2025 was issued at 04.48 p.m. The learned counsel for the respondents-petitioners in the respective writ appeal would point out that the notification issued by the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations, publishing the rank list of KEAM-2025, is also one issued on 01.07.2025, at 05.48 p.m.

32. The learned Advocate General would contend that when the Government

found that there exists disparity while standardizing the marks of those students who completed 12th Standard education in Kerala Higher Secondary stream and other streams, including CBSE, the standardizing formula was modified, in exercise of the powers under Clause 1.6 of the Prospectus-2025, vide the Government order dated 01.07.2025. When the standardization formula prescribed in the prospectus offend Article 14 of the Constitution of India, the Government is well within its powers to change the said formula, which would not amount to change of the rules of the game midway.

33. The learned counsel for additional respondents 3 and 4 in W.P.(C)No.24767 of 2025, who are respondents 3 and 4 in W.A.No.1702 of 2025, who are students completed 12th Standard education in Kerala Higher Secondary stream, would adopt the above argument of the learned Advocate General.

34. On the other hand, the learned Senior Counsel/ learned counsel for the respondents-petitioners in the writ appeals would contend that the action of the Government in modifying the standardization formula prescribed in the Prospectus-2025, vide the Government order dated 01.07.2025, would not amount to change of the rules of the game midway. Clause 1.6 of the prospectus will not authorise the Government to modify or replace the standardizing formula in the prospectus in the midway and the action of the Government in modifying the same vide the Government order dated 01.07.2025, would amount to change of the rules of the game midway. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner in W.P.(C)No.25230 of 2025 would also raise the very same contentions.

35. In Dr.Vinod K.M. [2012 (2) KHC 797], a Division Bench of this Court was dealing with the challenge made against the order of the State Government amending the prospectus for admission to Post Graduate Medical courses in the State, a day prior to the entrance examination, by which negative marking was withdrawn. A writ petition was filed challenging the said order, in which the learned Single Judge refused the interim relief of staying the operation of amendment to the prospectus. Before the Division Bench the Government relied on Clause XIX of the prospectus, which provides that the prospectus is subject to modification/addition as may be considered necessary by the Government. It was contended that the Government order amending the prospectus would not result in changing the rules after the game has started. The candidates aspiring for seats have no fundamental right to be enforced in respect of the same. It was also contended that without challenging the rank list the writ petitioners cannot maintain a challenge against the Government order whereby negative marking was withdrawn. Repelling the said contentions, the Division Bench held that the Government cannot say because of Clause XIX of the prospectus that they have a right to change the rules of the game at any time they want. Even if the Government have power to modify or add to the prospectus, such action must be a reasonable one without any arbitrariness and it should not suffer from discrimination. On the facts of the case on hand, the Division Bench found that though the prospectus was issued somewhere in December, 2011, till a day

before the examination, there was no move on the part of the Government to withdraw negative marking for in-service candidates. Everyone concerned must have been taken aback with such sudden decision, including some of the in-service candidates. Anything sans reasonableness and statutory force cannot be approved. Therefore, the Division Bench found that the argument of the learned Advocate General that Clause XIX of the prospectus empowers withdrawal of negative marking cannot be accepted.

36. In *Dr.Vinod K.M.* [2012 (2) KHC 797], the Division Bench has referred to the decision of another Division Bench in *Dr.Jayakumar E.K. v. Director of Medical Education and others* [ILR 2003 (3) Kerala 46]. In the said decision, the Division Bench was dealing with a case in which the challenge was against the Government order amending the prospectus for Medical Post Graduate Degree/Diploma Courses, 2002. In the said case prospectus for the year 2002 was issued on 26.06.2001 and the last date for submission of application was 30.11.2001. The prospectus came to be amended after the last date for submission of the application. The Division Bench disapproved the said move and held that Clause XVIII of the prospectus cannot be construed as to confer power on the Government to change the criteria for eligibility for admission to the course even after the last date for submission of the application. At least on the last date for submission of application the candidates should know definitely the criteria for eligibility for admission to the course. Neither the Director of Medical Education nor the Government can be permitted to change the criteria for eligibility for admission after the last date for submission of application. If they are permitted to do so, it would lead to arbitrary exercise of power to favour or to prejudice particular candidates depending on the whims and fancies of the authority concerned. To provide equal opportunity to the candidates and to maintain fairness and to provide arbitrariness in the matter of selection of candidates for admission, it is absolutely necessary that the criteria for eligibility for admission to the course are not changed after the last date for submission of application. If at all Clause XVIII empowered the Government to change the eligibility criteria for admission by issuing executive orders/notification, the said power can be exercised by the Government only before the last date for submission of application and not thereafter. On the date of the impugned judgment, not only the last date for submission of application was over but also the final select list for admission had been published. At that stage if the Government is asked to consider whether the eligibility criteria should be changed so as to make Lecturers in Nuclear Medicine also eligible for admission to M.D. General Medicine Course, the Government will in effect be considering whether two particular individuals (respondents 2 and 3) whose identity is known should be given the benefit of admission to the detriment of two individuals (appellants) whose identity also is known. This will strike at the root of the principle of fairness and equality of opportunity in the matter of selection of candidates for admission to the course. Hence, the impugned judgment to the extent it directed the Government to consider amendment of the prospectus for

the year 2002 was set aside by the Division Bench.

37. In *Sreeja S. v. State of Kerala* [2013 (1) KHC 230], a learned Single Judge of this Court was dealing with a case in which the challenge was against the amendment made to the prospectus for admission to Post B.Sc. Degree Courses under service quota, based on a rank list prepared according to the rank of the candidates in the Entrance Examination. Clause 1.6. of the prospectus provides that the prospectus or any part of it is subject to modification/addition/deletion, as may be necessary by the Government. On the ground that during all these years admissions to Post Basic Degree Course, Medical Post Graduate Degree Course and Medical Super Speciality Course, including Dental Degree Course under service quota, were being made on the basis of the seniority of the employees in service subject to their passing of the entrance examination, the Government amended the prospectus on the ground that the omission to provide seniority in service as a criteria in the prospectus is a mistake. Various decisions, including the decision in *Dr. Jayakumar E.K.* [ILR 2003 (3) Kerala 46], were relied on by the learned counsel for the petitioners. After considering the rival contentions, it was held that even if there is a power to amend the prospectus, it cannot be exercised at the final stage of the admission process and going by the decision of the Division Bench in *Dr. Jayakumar E.K.* [ILR 2003 (3) Kerala 46] it should have been exercised at least before the last date of submission of the application and the admission should be based on the conditions set out in the prospectus as it stood on the last date for submission of the application. In the said decision the learned Single Judge has referred to various decisions of this Court as well as the Apex Court regarding the power conferred for amending the prospectus.

38. In *Rachit Sinha v. Union of India* [(2018) 16 SCC 655], the Apex Court was dealing with a case in which the writ petitioners, who participated in the first round of counselling for the All-India quota seats for admission to the Postgraduate Courses in Medicine, were aggrieved by the changes that were made in the method of counselling by the notice dated 09.04.2018. Their grievance was that candidates who were ineligible for the second round of counselling according to the earlier procedure were made eligible as per the notice dated 09.04.2018. Another complaint was against the permission granted to the allottees in the first round of counselling to retain their seats for two days after the announcement of the results of the second round of counselling. The changes made by the notice dated 09.04.2018 were to the effect that even if a candidate is allotted a seat in the first round but did not report, he would be entitled to participate in the second round of counselling. A candidate who had reported but resigned was also made eligible to participate in the second round of counselling, contrary to the position that existed prior to 09.04.2018. According to the writ petitioners, the competition for the second round of counselling would increase as the above two categories of candidates who were not eligible to participate in the second round of counselling earlier were permitted to compete for admissions in the second round of counselling. They

contended that this change should not have been made after the commencement of admissions for the year.

39. In *Rachit Sinha* [(2018) 16 SCC 655], the Apex Court noticed that, it is clear from the record that the Medical Council of India decided to make certain changes to the method of admissions to the postgraduate courses to arrest the blocking of seats by certain candidates which was detrimental to the interest of meritorious candidates in the All-India quota. There is material on record to suggest that devious methods were adopted by certain candidates to block seats in the All-India quota and resign from those seats later, which resulted in the reversion of the All-India quota seats to the State quota. The Medical Counselling Committee identified about thousand candidates who were indulging in such illegal practice and proposes to take action against them after a thorough inquiry. Therefore, the Apex Court held that there is no infringement of any legal right of the petitioners in the change of the method of counselling made by the notice dated 09.04.2018. Reduction of chances of admission does not entail in violation of any right. If the change in the method of counselling was due to the circumstances mentioned above, there is no reason to interfere.

40. In *Seema Sebastain* [2023 (3) KHC 284], a Division Bench of this Court was dealing with a dispute that pertains to admission for Post Graduate Ayurveda Course-2022 under the service quota for medical officers. The point that came up for consideration before the Division Bench was as to whether, after the publication of the final list of candidates in the service quota, one of the eligibility criteria can be rectified/changed. The Division Bench noticed that the prospectus settles the candidates' admission criteria, etc. and gives a fair level playing field for every candidate who aspires for admission. A new claim cannot be admitted in the prospectus before the last date of submitting applications for admission. Amendment to the prospectus stands totally in a different perspective when there is a hostile discrimination between or among different classes standing on the same footing. If the prospectus fixes an eligibility criteria which offends Article 14 of the Constitution of India, it cannot be said it will hold good for everyone to participate in the same manner as provided under the prospectus without amendment. The right to challenge cannot be taken away merely because there is a timeline fixed in the prospectus. No doubt, laches may sometimes be canvassed as a defence to deny relief, but not to reject the challenge. When all similarly situated persons are not treated alike, that is open for challenge before the Constitutional Court. An injustice cured cannot be considered as a change of eligibility criteria. If such arguments are sustained, that would amount to a denial of the right to challenge such arbitrary clauses in the prospectus. No candidates can be denuded of fundamental rights on the ground that the prospectus sets a deadline.

41. In *Seema Sebastain* [2023 (3) KHC 284], on the facts of the case at hand, the Division Bench noticed that the retirement age for teachers' quota is fixed at 60. No one has any dispute on that. The Medical Officer, who enrolled after

01.04.2013 under the National Pension Scheme, also attains retirement at age 60. They stand at par in regard to the criteria for retirement. There cannot be discrimination among the same class of employees who are retiring at the same age. The objective criteria for fixing the upper age limit is that there should be seven years of service left after the completion of the course. The same rule must exist for all candidates in similar circumstances. When the same class of persons are treated differently, it results in discrimination. Merely for the reason that the Government passed an order, that does not cease to be a correctional order to uphold the concept of 'equality' as enshrined under Article 14 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, the Division Bench was of the considered view that the Government was justified in passing an order changing the eligibility criteria. The Division Bench noticed that the Government acted on the basis of the orders of this Court as well as on the basis of the power reserved by the Government in the prospectus, to amend the prospectus. This would certainly impact the rights of other candidates. The other candidates can object to such changes if any of their accrued rights are being divested consequent upon changing of the eligibility criteria. Mere inclusion in the select list will not confer any candidate with an indefeasible right to claim admission in accordance with the original ranking. Recasting a rank list would remove a patent injustice, which is an inevitable consequence of that process. It is not a case where candidates have been admitted to the programme and have started attending classes after the admission. No rights of the other candidates have now been taken away. Rearrangement of the rank may lower the prospects of getting admission. By inclusion in the select list, one is having only a legitimate expectation for consideration for admission and no right for admission has been crystallized by such inclusion. The legitimate expectation can be imperilled by a change of circumstances, an act of God or by judicial intervention.

42. In *Jumni Nasry* [2024:KER:20723] a Division Bench of this Court was dealing with the challenge against an order dated 20.05.2023 issued by the Ayush Department, Government of Kerala, permitting the inter-changing of special reservation seats for BHMS admission at Government Homeopathy Medical College, Thiruvananthapuram and the Government Homeopathic Medical College, Kozhikode, on rotation basis as per the prospectus for admission to Professional Degree Courses-UG Admission for the year 2023. Clause 1.6. of the prospectus empowers the State Government to modify/add/delete the provisions in the prospectus. Therefore, the contention was that the decision dated 20.05.2023 is one taken after considering the relevant facts and the earlier admission to the reserved quota. After considering the rival contentions, the Division Bench found that though Clause 1.6. of the prospectus empowers the State Government to modify/add/delete the provisions in the prospectus, as may be deemed necessary, the said power cannot be used arbitrarily when the authority was fully aware of the decision by the Revamp Committee of the UGC and request for inter-change of seats was pending consideration before the issuance of the prospectus dated 16.03.2023. Therefore, the Division Bench found that the submission

advanced by the learned Senior Government Pleader regarding the power under Clause 1.6. of the prospectus cannot be made applicable in the facts of the case at hand.

43. In *Tej Prakash Pathak* [(2025) 2 SCC 1], in the context of recruitment to public service the Apex Court held that the eligibility criteria for being placed in the select list, notified at the time of commencement of recruitment process, cannot be changed midway through the recruitment process unless the extant rules so permit. Even if such a change is permissible under the extant rules or the advertisement, the change would have to meet the requirements of Article 14 of the Constitution and satisfy the test of arbitrariness.

44. In the instant case, the amendment made to the Prospectus-2025, vide the Government order dated 01.07.2025, is in respect of the standardization formula followed in KEAM from the year 2011 onwards. As evident from Clause 9.7.4(b) (iii) of the Prospectus-2025, the said standardization formula was one approved by the Expert Committee constituted vide G.O.(Rt)No. 1758/2011/H.Edn. dated 03.11.2011. Now, a formula for standardization, which is substantially at variance with the existing formula, is introduced by way of that amendment. The said fact is not in serious dispute.

45. The request of the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations for modification of the standardization formula was one made before the Government on 03.11.2024. It is thereafter that the Government vide G.O.(Ms.)No.97/2025/HEDN dated 19.02.2025 approved the Prospectus-2025. In the report dated 02.06.2025 submitted by the Standardization Review Committee, which we have extracted hereinbefore at paragraph 19, the Committee after detailed discussions opined that introducing a new formula or making any modifications to the existing one would only be possible after thorough and detailed studies and it must also be ensured that any new formula is demonstrably better than the current one. Therefore, the recommendation of the Committee in its report is that implementing a new formula during this year is not feasible as it needs more time.

46. As already noticed hereinbefore, the amendment made to the standardization formula in the Prospectus-2025 vide the Government order dated 01.07.2025, some of which have been extracted hereinbefore at paragraphs 21 to 24, are not in tune with the recommendations of the Standardization Review Committee, as contained in its report dated 02.06.2025. Even the materials relied on by the Government to arrive at a decision to modify the standardization formula, which was in force from the year 2011, are not part of the pleadings and materials on record. The said materials are also not discernible either from the report dated 02.06.2025 submitted by the Standardization Review Committee or the Report dated 05.06.2025 of the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations.

47. The standardization formula modified vide the Government order dated

01.07.2025 provides for adding the marks of Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry in the ratio of 5:3:2, instead of the existing ratio of 1:1:1, while maintaining the existing 50:50 ratio for the entrance examination marks and marks in Plus Two (XII) Board. The Standardization Review Committee has not even suggested or recommended a modified ratio of 5:3:2 for adding the marks of Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry in its report dated 02.06.2025. The introduction of a formula for standardization, which is substantially at variance with the existing formula, just before the publication of the rank list, is legally impermissible, and the power conferred on the Government under Clause 1.6 of the Prospectus-2025 would not enable the Government to introduce a formula for standardization, which is substantially at variance with the existing formula, just before the publication of the rank list, in view of the law laid down in the decisions of this Court in Dr.Jayakumar E.K. [ILR 2003 (3) Kerala 46], Dr.Vinod K.M. [2012 (2) KHC 797], Sreeja S. [2013 (1) KHC 230] and Jumni Nasry [2024:KER:20723] and also the decision of the Apex Court in Tej Prakash Pathak [(2025) 2 SCC 1] (a decision in the context of recruitment to public service).

48. The decision of the Apex Court in Rachit Sinha [(2018) 16 SCC 655] was in the context of an amendment made to the prospectus for counselling for the All-India quota seats for admission to the Postgraduate Courses in Medicine regarding the changes made in the method of counselling, by the notice dated 09.04.2018, whereby, even if a candidate is allotted a seat in the first round but did not report, he would be entitled to participate in the second round of counselling. The Apex Court noticed that the said modification was made based on the decision taken by the Medical Council of India to arrest the blocking of seats by certain candidates which was detrimental to the interest of meritorious candidates in the All-India quota. Therefore, the Apex Court held that there is no infringement of any legal right of the petitioners in the change of the method of counselling made by the notice dated 09.04.2018, and that, the reduction of chances of admission does not entail in violation of any right.

49. In Seema Sebastain [2023 (3) KHC 284] the Division Bench of this Court was dealing with question as to whether after the publication of the final list of candidates in the service quota for admission to Post Graduate Ayurveda Course-2022, one of the eligibility criteria can be rectified/changed. The Division Bench noticed that the retirement age for teachers' quota is fixed at 60. The Medical Officer, who enrolled after 01.04.2013 under the National Pension Scheme, also attains retirement at age 60. They stand at par in regard to the criteria for retirement. When the same class of persons are treated differently, it results in discrimination. Therefore, the Division Bench was of the considered view that the Government was justified in passing an order changing the eligibility criteria.

50. The law laid down by the Apex Court in Rachit Sinha [(2018) 16 SCC 655] and that laid down by the Division Bench of this Court in Seema Sebastain [2023 (3) KHC 284] have no application to the facts and circumstances of the case at

hand, which deals with introduction of a formula for standardization, which is substantially at variance with the existing formula, just before the publication of the rank list. The said formula provides for adding the marks of Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry in the ratio of 5:3:2, instead of the existing ratio of 1:1:1, while maintaining the existing 50:50 ratio for the entrance examination marks and marks in Plus Two (XII) Board, which was not even suggested or recommended by the Standardization Review Committee in its report dated 02.06.2025. Even the materials relied on by the Government to arrive at a decision to modify the standardization formula, which was in force from the year 2011, are not part of the pleadings and materials on record. Therefore, we find absolutely no force in the contention raised on behalf of the appellants that the newly introduced standardization formula would not offend Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the result, we find no merits in these writ appeals. The impugned judgment dated 09.07.2025 of the learned Single Judge, whereby the Government order dated 01.07.2025 has been set aside and the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations has been directed to publish rank list in accordance with the Prospectus-2025, which was approved vide Government order dated 19.02.2025, i.e., without reference to the amendments made to the said prospectus vide the Government order dated 01.07.2025, warrants no interference. These writ appeals are accordingly dismissed and the writ petition, i.e., W.P.(C)No. 25230 of 2025, is disposed of in terms of the judgment dated 09.07.2025 of the learned Single Judge in W.P.(C)No.24767 of 2025 and connected matters.