

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P. (S) No. 4274 of 2024

Namita Raje, aged about 28 years, daughter of Shri Sanjay Kumar, resident of House No.707-A, Bishunpur Road, Near D.V.C. Colony, Jhumri Tilaiya, P.O.- & P.S.-Jhumri Tilaiya, District- Koderma.

... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through the Secretary/Principal Secretary, Personnel, Administrative Reforms and Rajbhasha Department, having office at Project Building, Dhurwa, P.O. & P.S.- Dhurwa, Town & District-Ranchi.
2. The Jharkhand Public Service Commission, through its Secretary, having office at Circular Road, P.O. & P.S.-Lalpur, Town and District-Ranchi.
3. The Controller Examination, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, having office at Circular Road, P.O. & P.S.-Lalpur, Town and District-Ranchi.

... Respondents

WITH

W.P. (S) No. 2171 of 2024

Shubhra Khanna, aged about 34 yrs, D/o. Manoj Khanna, R/o H.No.688, 2nd Floor, Block-D, Chittranjan Park, P.O & P.S- Kalkaji, Dist- South Delhi (Delhi)-110019.

... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand.
2. The Chairman, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, P.O & P.S- Namkum, Ranchi.
3. The Secretary, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, P.O & P.S- Namkum, Ranchi.
4. The Joint Secretary, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, P.O & P.S- Namkum, Ranchi.
5. Controller of Examination, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, P.O & P.S- Namkum, Ranchi.

... Respondents

WITH

W.P. (S) No. 4178 of 2024

Akanksha Priya, aged about 27 years, daughter of Shri Alok Kumar, resident of Village-Baghour, P.O.-Baghour, P.S.-Halsi, District-Lakhisarai (Bihar)

... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through the Secretary/Principal Secretary, Personnel, Administrative Reforms and Rajbhasha Department, having office at Project Building, Dhurwa, P.O. & P.S.- Dhurwa, Town & District-Ranchi.
2. Jharkhand Public Service Commission, through its Secretary, having office at Circular Road, P.O. & P.S.-Lalpur, District- Ranchi.
3. The Examination Controller, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, having office at Circular Road, P.O. & P.S.-Lalpur, District-Ranchi.

... Respondents

WITH**W.P. (S) No. 4667 of 2024**

1. Riya Sonal, aged about 27 years, daughter of Ashok Kumar Sahu, resident of Mahabir Market, Upper Bazar, Pyada Toli, Ranchi, P.O. G.P.O., P.S. Kotwali, District Ranchi, PIN-834001 (Jharkhand).
2. Siddhartha Pandit, aged about 29 years, son of Dharmendra Kumar Sharma, resident of Jyotish Kunj, Near Central Warehouse, Najibabad Road Bijnor, P.O. & P.S. Bijnor, District Bijnor, PIN-246701 (Uttar Pradesh).
3. Deep Raj, aged about 25 years, son of Niraj Kumar, resident of Ward No. 25, Baghi, Begusarai, Suhird Nagar, P.O. & P.S. Begusarai, District Begusarai, PIN-851218 (Bihar).
4. Shweta Tripathi, aged about 24 years, daughter of Manoj Kumar Tripathi, resident of 97/84/1 Badsahi Mandi, Hiwet Road, P.O. & P.S. Allahabad, District Allahabad, PIN-211003 (Uttar Pradesh).
5. Akansha Singh, aged about 27 years, daughter of Parmanand Singh, resident of Bamngora, Near Salgajhari Railway Halt, P.O. Sarjamda, P.S. Parsudih, Town Jamshedpur, Tatanagar, District East Singhbhum, PIN-831002 (Jharkhand).
6. Satyam Parashar, aged about 32 years, son of Arun Kumar Singh, resident of 27, Hasanpur, Chainpur, P.O. & P.S. Kundwa, District East Champaran, PIN-845304 (Bihar).
7. Shubhranshu Rai, aged about 27 years, son of Ravi Shankar Rai, resident of B-12, Sagar Pearl, Hoshangabad Road, Near Shanti Mandir, Ward No. 53, Huzur, P.O. & P.S. Misrod, District Bhopal, PIN-462026 (Madhya Pradesh).
8. Akarsh Kumar, aged about 25 years, son of Dhruwa Narain Yadav, resident of N8/245EJ-1, Vishwanath Puri Colony. Newada, P.O. & P.S. Varanasi, District Varanasi, PIN-221005 (Uttar Pradesh).

9. Divya Raj, aged about 30 years, son of Rana Vijay Singh, resident of 16/240, Homeguard Office, Deoria, Ward No. 24, Deoria, P.O. & P.S. Deoria, Dist. Deoria, PIN-274001 (Uttar Pradesh).
10. Deepak Arya, aged about 32 years, son of Inderjeet Arya, resident of SCF No. 39, New Anaj Mandi, Kalanwali, Ward No.11, Kalanwali, Sirsa, P.O. & P.S. Kalanwali, Dist. Sirsa, PIN-125201 (Haryana).
11. Sambhawi, aged about 27 years, daughter of Sampurna Nand Jha, resident of Ward No. 29, Jaldhari Chowk, Madhubani, P.O. & P.S. Madhubani, Dist. Madhubani, PIN-847211 (Bihar).

... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand, through Chief Secretary, having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. & P.S. Jagganathpur, District Ranchi, PIN-834004 (Jharkhand).
2. The Secretary, Department of Personnel, Administrative Reforms & Rajbhasha, Government of Jharkhand, having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. & P.S. Jagganathpur, District Ranchi, PIN-834004 (Jharkhand).
3. The Jharkhand Public Service Commission, through its Secretary, having its office at Circular Road, P.O. & P.S. Lalpur, District Ranchi, PIN-834001 (Jharkhand).
4. Controller of Examination, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, having its office at Circular Road, P.O. & P.S. Lalpur, District Ranchi, PIN-834001 (Jharkhand).

... Respondents

WITH

W.P. (S) No. 4702 of 2024

Kshitij, aged about 30 years, S/o Mohan Choubey, R/o B108, Shree Ram Krishna Enclave, Green Park, New Area, Adalhatu Road, PO Morabadi, PS Bariatu Ranchi, Jharkhand

... Petitioner

Versus

1. Secretary, Jharkhand Public Service Commission
2. Controller of Examination, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, Both situated at Circular Road, Ahirtoli, PO GPO, PS Lalpur, District Ranchi, Jharkhand 834001
3. Secretary, Department of Personnel, Administrative Reforms & Rajbhasha, situated at Project Building, PO & PS – Dhurwa, District Ranchi (Jharkhand).

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN**

 For the Petitioners: Mr. Sumeet Gadodia, Advocate
 Mr. Manoj Tandon, Advocate
 Mr. Shailesh Poddar, Advocate
 Mr. Ashish Kumar, Advocate
 For the State: Mr. Manish Kumar, Sr. S.C.-II
 Mr. Kishore Kumar Singh, S.C.-V
 Mr. Ratnesh Kumar, S.C. (L&C)-I
 Mr. Krishna Prajapati, A.C. to S.C.-V
 Mrs. Nirupma, A.C. to Sr. S.C.-II
 For the JPSC: Mr. Sanjoy Piprawall, Advocate
 Mr. Pravin Kumar Pandey, Advocate
 Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate

Reserved on: 08.04.2025

Pronounced on: 25/04/2025

Per M.S. Ramachandra Rao, C.J.

1. In this batch of writ petitions, the petitioners have challenged the revised answer keys notified by the Jharkhand Public Service Commission (for short 'JPSC') through a Press Release dt. 13.05.2024 in regard to certain questions in the examination conducted by it for appointment of Civil Judges (Junior Division) through an Advertisement No.22/2023 dt. 14.08.2023 under the Jharkhand Judicial Service (Recruitment) Regulations, 2013.
2. The questions with regard to which there is challenge in these cases are questions in the preliminary entrance test (multiple choice/objective type).
3. All the petitioners in this batch of cases have appeared in the said examination.
4. We shall deal with the facts in W.P. (S) No. 4667 of 2024 by way of illustration.
5. We may point out that the counsel for the petitioners in this case has confined the prayer in the writ petitions to the answers to Question

Nos.8, 74 and 96 of Series Booklet A only. These very questions had been given other numbers in Series B, C and D also.

6. Question No.8 reads as under:-

“8. Choose the correct sentence from the following.

(A) More than one boy was absent from the class.

(B) More than one boy were absent from the class.

(C) More than one boy absent from the class.

(D) More than two boys was absent from the class.”

7. Petitioners contend that they had chosen answer against the said question as Option (A), but the respondents-JPSC has published the revised answer-keys and Option (B) has been made a correct option therein wrongly.

8. Question No.74 reads as under:

“74. In an Order in the Ashwini Kumar Upadhyay Vs. Union of India (W.P. (Civil) No.943/2021) Case, the Supreme Court directed, inter alia, that States and Union Territories “shall ensure immediately, as and when any speech of any action takes place which attracts offences such as Section _____ of Indian Penal Code etc., without any complaint being filed, suo motu action be taken to register cases and proceed against the offenders in accordance with law”. The provisions of IPC stated by Supreme Court included

(A) Section 153 A and 153B

(B) Section 295 A

(C) Section 506

(D) All the above Sections.”

9. According to the petitioners, the JPSC has shown Option (D) as the correct answer, i.e., “All of the above Sections.”, i.e., Sections 153 A and 153B, Section 295 A, and Section 506, but, a perusal of the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Ashwini Kumar Upadhyay Vs. Union of India* [W.P. (Civil) No. 943/2021], which is referred to in the said question, indicates that in the said judgment Section 506 is not mentioned and Section 505 is mentioned. Therefore, petitioners contend that Option (D) given by the JPSC is incorrect.

10. The third question, which is under challenge, is Question No.96, which reads as under:

“96. Which of the following is incorrect about agency under the Indian Contract Act?

(A) An agent may be employed to do any act for the principal.

(B) Only such person may be employed as agent who has obtained the age of majority.

(C) The authority of agent must be expressed in writing.

(D) No consideration is necessary to create an agency.

11. According to the petitioners, the candidates appearing for the exam were asked to choose which of the statements was incorrect about the law of agency under the Indian Contract Act mentioned in the said question.

According to them, initially the JPSC indicated Option (C) to be the correct answer, but, later, revised it to Option (A).

According to the petitioners, under Section 182 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, an agent can be employed to do any act for the principal and, therefore, Option (A) given by the JPSC is wrong.

They also point out that Option (B), which states that “*Only such person may be employed as agent who has obtained the age of majority*” is incorrect, because, under Section 184 of the Indian Contract Act, a minor can also be an agent but he will not be responsible to his principal.

They also contend that Option (C) given by the JPSC that “*The authority of agent must be expressed in writing*” is also incorrect, because under Section 186, agency can also be implied.

They, therefore, contend that both options (B) and (C) would be the correct answers to Question No.96 and Option (A) given by the JPSC is wrong.

12. Counsel for the petitioners places reliance on the judgments of the Supreme Court in **Kanpur University & Ors v. Samir Gupta & Ors¹** and **Ran Vijay Singh & Ors v. State of U.P. & Ors²**.

13. Counsel for the JPSC, on the other hand, vehemently contended that there is no provision in the Rules for re-evaluation, and so a direction cannot be issued to the JPSC by this Court even if the contention of the petitioners is accepted.

14. Reliance is placed by counsel for JPSC on the judgments of the Supreme Court in **Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission v. Mukesh Thakur and another³**, **Vikesh Kumar Gupta and Anr v. State of Rajasthan and Ors⁴** and **High Court of Tripura through the Registrar General v. Tirtha Sarathi Mukherjee & Ors⁵**. They also placed reliance on the judgments of Division Bench of this Court in **Sonu**

¹ (1983) 4 SCC 309

² (2018) 2 SCC 357

³ (2010) 6 SCC 759

⁴ (2021) 2 SCC 309

⁵ (2019) 16 SCC 663

Choudhary v. The State of Jharkhand & Ors⁶, Deepak Lal Pandey v. The State of Jharkhand & Ors⁷ and Prem Ranjan & Ors v. Jharkhand State Staff Selection Commission & Ors⁸.

Consideration by the Court

15. We have noted the contentions of the parties.

16. In **Kanpur University & Ors** (supra 1), the Supreme Court considered the issue and held that normally the key answer should be correct unless it is proved to be wrong and that it should not be held to be wrong by inferential process of reasoning or by a process of rationalization. It held that it must be clearly demonstrated to be wrong, that is to say, it must be such as no reasonable body of men well-versed in the particular subject would regard as correct.

In that case, the Supreme Court interfered with the key answers by holding that the contention of the University is falsified because large number of acknowledged text-books, which are commonly read by students of State of U.P., leave no room for doubt that the answer given by the students was correct and the key answer was incorrect. It held that there was no doubt the University was wrong and in case there was a such a doubt, the Court would have unquestionably preferred the key answer, but since the matter was beyond the realm of doubt, it would be unfair to penalize the students for not giving an answer which accords with the key answer, that is to say, with an answer which is demonstrated to be wrong.

17. The question whether the High Court under Article 226 should interfere when there is no rule permitting re-evaluation was considered in

⁶ W.P. (C) No. 3931 of 2019 dt. 14.08.2019

⁷ L.P.A. No. 255 of 2024 dt. 18.03.2025

⁸ L.P.A. No. 146 of 2019 dt. 08.11.2023

the decision of **Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission v. Mukesh Thakur** (supra 3).

The Supreme Court held, placing reliance on its decision in **Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education v. Paritosh Bhupeshkumar Sheth**⁹, that in the absence of provision of re-evaluation, a direction for re-evaluation cannot be issued by the Court.

In that case, the High Court had directed the Commission to produce answer-sheet before it and got the answer-sheet re-evaluated by another examiner and on the basis of the marks given by the said examiner, directed the Commission to issue letter of the appointment to the respondent, but this was set aside by Supreme Court.

18. We may point out that in the instant case, petitioners are not asking for summoning their answer-books and getting them re-evaluated, but they are questioning the key answer given by the Commission to be incorrect.

19. In **Ran Vijay Singh's** case (supra 2), the Supreme Court considered the judgment in **Mukesh Thakur** (supra 3) and interpreted it to mean that there was no suggestion in **Mukesh Thakur** of a complete hands-off or no-interference approach, nor was suggested in any other decisions of the Supreme Court that such is the legal position; and that, in fact, the case law developed by the said Court admits of interference in the results of an examination but in rare and exceptional situations and to a very limited extent.

After referring to the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Kanpur University's case** (supra 1), it held that the onus is on the candidate to clearly demonstrate that the key answer is incorrect and that too without

⁹ (1984) 4 SCC 27

any inferential process or reasoning. The burden on the candidate is, therefore, rather heavy and constitutional courts must be extremely cautious in entertaining the plea challenging the correctness of the key answers.

It also distinguished the judgment of the **Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education** (supra 9) by holding that in that case, the question was whether, under law, the candidate had a right to demand an inspection, verification and re-evaluation of answer books and whether the statutory regulations framed by the Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education governing the subject (insofar as they categorically state that there shall be no such right) can be said to be ultra vires, unreasonable and void.

The Supreme Court in that case merely held that the Regulations were not illegal or unreasonable or ultra vires the rule-making power conferred by the statute.

20. The Supreme Court in **Ran Vijay Singh** (supra 2) then culled out the following principles in paragraph 30 as under:-

30. The law on the subject is therefore, quite clear and we only propose to highlight a few significant conclusions. They are:

30.1. If a statute, Rule or Regulation governing an examination permits the re-evaluation of an answer sheet or scrutiny of an answer sheet as a matter of right, then the authority conducting the examination may permit it;

30.2. If a statute, Rule or Regulation governing an examination does not permit re-evaluation or scrutiny of an answer sheet (as distinct from prohibiting it) then the court may permit re-evaluation or scrutiny only if it is demonstrated very clearly, without any

“inferential process of reasoning or by a process of rationalisation” and only in rare or exceptional cases that a material error has been committed;

30.3. The court should not at all re-evaluate or scrutinise the answer sheets of a candidate—it has no expertise in the matter and academic matters are best left to academics;

30.4. The court should presume the correctness of the key answers and proceed on that assumption; and

30.5. In the event of a doubt, the benefit should go to the examination authority rather than to the candidate.”

21. A reading of the above judgment in **Ran Vijay Singh** (supra 2) indicates that even if a statute, Rule or Regulation governing an examination does not permit re-evaluation or scrutiny of an answer sheet as distinct from prohibiting it, then the court may permit re-evaluation or scrutiny only if it is demonstrated very clearly, without any “inferential process of reasoning or by a process of rationalization”, and only in rare and exceptional cases that a material error has been committed.

22. In the instant case, it is the stand of the JPSC that there is no provision for re-evaluation of answer-book in the Rules/advertisement. They do not say that there is a prohibition to conduct re-evaluation.

23. In **U.P. Public Service Commission v. Rahul Singh**¹⁰ also, the Supreme Court discussed the power of High Court to interfere in matters of academic nature including the decision of **Kanpur University** (supra 1) and **Ran Vijay Singh** (supra 2). It reiterated that constitutional courts must exercise restraint in such matters and reiterated the principles laid down therein. It, however, found on the facts of that case that the

¹⁰ (2018) 7 SCC 254

questions, whose answers were challenged, needed a long process of reasoning, and there were conflicting views as to what was the correct answer and in that situation, it held that the court should bow to the opinion of the experts.

24. Again in the case of **High Court of Tripura through the Registrar General** (supra 5), the Supreme Court held, after referring to the judgment in **Ran Vijay Singh** (supra 2), that the wide power under Article 226 may continue to be available even though there is no provision for re-valuation in a situation where a candidate, despite having given correct answer, and about which there cannot be even the slightest manner of doubt, is treated as having given the wrong answer, and consequently the candidate is found disentitled to any marks. It held that if this is demonstrated before a writ court, the writ court cannot be expected to be helpless despite the vast reservoir of power which it possesses, though, the said power has to be exercised in rare and exceptional cases.

25. The Punjab and Haryana High Court in the case of **Harvinder Singh Johal v. Registrar General, Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court and Another**¹¹ relied on the judgments in **Kanpur University** (supra 1) and **Ran Vijay Singh** (supra 2) and held that the Court can interfere if it is demonstrated very clearly without any inferential process of reasoning or by a process of rationalization that the answer key is palpably wrong or demonstrated to be wrong even if the objections have been considered by the experts. It then went out to consider the objections of the petitioners in regard to the answer key published by the paper setters and also the report of the expert's committee and also four

¹¹ 2019 SCC Online P&H 3912

questions whose answers were doubted, and interfered with two of the answers to the questions.

26. In Rishabh Duggal v. Registrar General, Delhi High Court¹², Delhi High Court also referred to the judgment in **Kanpur University** (supra 1) and other decisions rendered by the said Court and reiterated that the Court would not act as an appellate body to review the correctness of the answer key; but the Court will interfere with the decision of the examining authority only if it is satisfied that the decision is palpably erroneous and demonstrates facial arbitrariness. It referred to the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Manish Ujwal v. Maharishi Dayanand Saraswati University¹³** where the Court had emphasized the need for ensuring that the questions in a multiple choice objective type tests are unambiguous and capable of only one clear answer.

27. It is true that in certain decisions rendered by this Court referred to by the counsel for respondents, a conservative approach had been adopted and this Court had not interfered with the challenge made by the petitioners to the answer keys.

28. In Vikesh Kumar Gupta and Anr (supra 4) also, the Supreme Court, no doubt, observed that re-evaluation can be directed if rules permit and practice of re-evaluation and scrutiny of questions by courts should not be done when they lack expertise in academic matters. The Supreme Court also considered the judgment of **Ran Vijay Singh** (supra 2), but did not overrule it as regards the principles laid down in paragraph 30 thereof, referred to above in para 20.

¹² 2024 SCC OnLine Del 1916

¹³ (2005) 13 SCC 744

29. In the instant case, therefore, notwithstanding the absence of a provision permitting re-evaluation of the answers given in the key answer by the respondents, since the examination in question and the questions in respect of which the answer key is doubted pertain to “English language” and the subject “Law”, and not other technical subjects (such as Science) in respect of which this Court can be held not to have expertise, and since in the facts and circumstances of the case we are satisfied that the key answers, to the questions mentioned above are demonstrated without any inferential process of reasoning or by a process of rationalization by the petitioners, to be incorrect, as explained below, and since we are of the opinion that no reasonable body of men well-versed in the subjects of English and Law can regard them as correct, we reject the technical pleas raised by the JPSC and propose to go further and deal with the questions in respect of whom the answer-key is alleged to be demonstrably wrong.

30. As regards Question No.8, without a doubt, Option (A) is the correct answer and Option (B) given by JPSC cannot be said to be correct.

31. Coming to the Question No.74, the same is based on the decision of the Supreme Court in *Ashwini Kumar Upadhyay Vs. Union of India* [W.P. (Civil) No. 943/2021], copy of which is placed before us.

After perusing the same, we are satisfied that in the said judgment the Supreme Court mentioned only Sections 153A, 153B, Section 295A and Section 505, etc. It did not mention Section 506.

Therefore, the JPSC’s answer, i.e. Option (D) (which included Section 506 IPC), cannot be said to be correct.

In fact, both answers (A) and (B) would be correct as well.

We reject the plea of the counsel for JPSC that the word ‘etc.’ mentioned in the said judgment would cover Section 506 IPC as well,

because if such an interpretation is given, the word ‘etc.’ would cover every Section in the Indian Penal Code, and that could not have been the intention of the Supreme Court in the above judgment.

32. Coming to Question No.96, initially the JPSC indicated Option (C) to be the correct answer, but, later, revised it to Option (A).

Under Section 182 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, an agent can be employed to do any act for the principal and, therefore, Option (A) given by the JPSC is wrong.

Option (B) states that “*Only such person may be employed as agent who has obtained the age of majority*” is incorrect, because, under Section 184 of the Indian Contract Act, a minor can also be an agent but he will not be responsible to his principal.

Option (C) given by the JPSC that “*The authority of agent must be expressed in writing*” is also incorrect, because under Section 186, agency can also be implied.

Thus, petitioners are right in contending that both options (B) and (C) would be the correct answers to Question No.96 and Option (A) given by the JPSC is wrong.

33. Therefore, we agree with the contention of the counsel for the petitioners that the key answer given by JPSC to Question Nos.8, 74 and 96 in Booklet ‘A’ are incorrect.

34. As regards the pleas raised by the counsel for the petitioners in this batch of cases with regard to other questions, we are not persuaded to accept them as we do not find any merit in them.

35. We also do not find any merit in the stand of the petitioners that it was the duty of the JPSC to call candidates up to 15 times of the total vacancy category-wise for appearing in the main examination and that it

has not done so, since this plea was specifically rejected by an order passed by this Court on 25.02.2025 in W.P. (S) No.4191 of 2024 cited “*Rajveer Singh Vs The State of Jharkhand and others*”.

36. Therefore, the Writ Petitions are allowed as above and the JPSC is directed to give one mark to the persons who answered to Option (A) in Question No.8 in Booklet A and delete Question No.74 and Question No.96 in Booklet A from consideration.

37. It is not in dispute that the total marks for this examination is 100 i.e., one mark for correct answer to each of the 100 objective type questions contained in the question papers. The cut-off marks for different categories of students have also been prescribed.

38. Once the two questions mentioned above in para 36 are deleted, there would be only 98 questions with total 98 marks.

39. The JPSC shall first compute the marks obtained by each candidate as per this judgment for total 98 marks.

Since such marks obtained would be for 98 questions carrying total 98 marks only, it shall then recompute the marks of each candidate taking the total marks as 100 as indicated below and then apply the cut-off mark.

For example, if a candidate of UNR category gets 75 marks out of 98 total marks, the JPSC shall recompute the marks obtained as if the total marks are 100 in the following manner:

$$75/98 \times 100 = 76.53.$$

For this UNR category, the cut-off mark fixed is 75, and so the said candidate would qualify in the Preliminary examination.

40. The JPSC shall thus compute the marks of the candidates who appeared in the examination and publish the final merit-list of the successful candidates keeping in mind the above directions.

41. This exercise shall be completed by the JPSC within four weeks from today.
42. With the aforesaid directions and observations, the writ petitions are partly allowed. No costs.
43. All pending applications shall stand closed.

(M.S. Ramachandra Rao, C.J.)

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

N.F.R.

Manoj/-