

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR**

**BEFORE
HON'BLE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE VIVEK RUSIA
&
HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PRADEEP MITTAL**

WRIT PETITION No. 3091 of 2026

PREMLATA TIWARI

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Ankit Saxena - Advocate and Shri Ritik Sharma - Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Ritwik Parashar- Government Advocate for respondent/State.

Shri Neeraj Singh Chauhan- Advocate for respondent no.2 and 3.

Shri Anurag Gohil - Advocate for the Mindlogicx Infratech Limited.

WITH

WRIT PETITION No. 897 of 2026

AMARJEET BHARDWAJ

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Siddharth Shrivastava - Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Ritwik Parashar- Government Advocate for respondent/State.

Shri Neeraj Singh Chauhan- Advocate for respondent no.4.

Shri Anurag Gohil - Advocate for the Mindlogicx Infratech Limited.

Reserved on : 13.05.2026

Pronounced on : 15.06.2026

Per: Justice Vivek Rusia

Since there are common facts and grounds in both the writ petitions, all of them are being heard and decided analogously through a common order. For the purpose of this order, the facts are being taken from W.P. No.3091/2026 as a leading case.

2. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking revaluation of the subject Psychiatric (Mental Health) Nursing of M.Sc. Nursing (Second Year) Final Examination, 2025. The petitioner is a student of M.Sc. Nursing (Batch Year 2023-25), and at present, she is pursuing her 2nd year at Madhya Pradesh Medical Science University, Jabalpur (hereinafter referred to as 'the University'). The petitioner claims herself to be a student with good academic performance up to the graduation level. She has cleared 1st year of M.Sc. in all the subjects in first attempt with good marks. Thereafter, she was upgraded to the M.Sc. Nursing (Second Year). The university issued her admit card to appear in all the subjects scheduled from 22.05.2025 to 27.05.2025. The petitioner appeared in all the subjects, and the university declared the result on 23.09.2025. She was declared 'failed' in Psychiatric (Mental Health) Nursing by securing 22 marks out of 75 in theory - External Exam. The minimum passing marks in a subject are 50 out of 100 (75 marks in External and 25 marks in Internal Assessment). The petitioner secured only 20 marks out of 75 in External, and 22 marks out of 25 in Internal Assessment. In total, the petitioner secured an aggregate of 458 marks out of 600. Being dissatisfied with the

marks, she applied for re-verification of the answer sheets. The answer sheets were re-checked, and she was informed vide letter dated 06.11.2025 as to No Change in the marks. Thereafter, the petitioner submitted a detailed representation on 07.11.2025 and also applied under the RTI Act to get the answer sheet of the concerned failed subject.

3. According to the petitioner, she attempted all the answers correctly, but arbitrarily and inexplicably, she was awarded only 20 marks out of 75. Again, she submitted a detailed representation to the Vice Chancellor and Controller of the Examination for re-checking and fair evaluation of her answer sheet. She also filed a complaint on the CM Helpline Portal, and thereafter, filed this present petition before this Court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a photocopy of the answer sheet supplied under the RTI Act reveals that her answers were marked as correct for Questions 4(a), 4(d), 4(e), 4(f), and 4(g) by the examiner, but no marks were given to her.

5. After notice in the writ petition, the respondents Nos. 2 and 3 have filed the reply. The writ petition came up for hearing on 30.01.2026. During the argument, we found that the answer sheet supplied under the RTI Act shows that the answer sheets were digitally scanned and thereafter checked by the examiner digitally, not in a physical mode. Therefore, called upon the respondents Nos. 2 and 3 to explain this digital mode of checking of the answer sheets.

6. The respondents Nos. 2 and 3 filed the reply disclosing that the medical university adopted dual valuation of every answer script of theory exams across all the faculty by amending Clause 60 of the Ordinance No.06/2014 in the year 2023. The university issued a tender to invite the agency for an end-to-end examination management system for secured question paper delivery, digital evaluation of answer scripts, result processing and allied services. An agreement was executed with outsource agency, namely, Mindlogicx Infratech Ltd., a highly reputed Bangalore-based software company. After completion of the examination, the university hand over all the answer sheets to the outsource agency in a sealed envelope, and the agency, in the first instance, after scanning the answer sheet, cover of the first page of the answer book by digital mask and coding the entire answer sheet for secrecy of the candidate, and thereafter send a scanned copy of answer sheet to two different valuer digitally. Both the valuer value the answer sheet separately and submit their marks digitally. At the time of preparation of the result, the highest marks received by a candidate in one of the two valuations are considered as marks obtained by a candidate in a particular subject.

7. It is further submitted that the entire system of examination, which includes the delivery of a secured question paper to the declaration of results, is an online process and is done by an outsourced agency, in which no physical interference is possible, and the same is a foolproof system. A similar issue, concerning the revaluation of an answer sheet by way of a digitally scanned

copy, came up for consideration before this Court in the case of *Yashwini Bhagchandani vs. MP Medical Science University*, W.P.No.6441/2021. By order dated 27.04.2021, the writ petition has been dismissed, upholding the aforesaid system.

8. Actually, the petitioner was fully satisfied with the valuation pattern of the university, in which she secured an aggregate of 458 marks out of 600. Since she did not receive the marks as per her expectation in the Psychiatric (Mental Health) Nursing subject, the petitioner is not challenging the entire valuation system of the University.

9. We called upon Mindlogicx Infratech Ltd. to submit the complete working pattern of the software developed by them in the domain of the examination management system. Mr Srijith P.S., Director of the company, filed an affidavit by submitting that Mindlogicx Infratech Ltd. has developed a software platform for automation of the examination management process, including digital evaluation of answer scripts (On-Screen Marking/Digital Evaluation). The company agreed with Madhya Pradesh Medical Science University, Jabalpur, on 16.07.2018, intending to provide a technology platform to the university to automate certain examination-related processes, including digital evaluation of scanned answer booklets. The company acts solely as a technology service provider and has no control over the exam scheduling, question paper setting, faculty selection for evaluation, marking schemes, moderation rules, and result processing, which are under the control and

approval of the University. The Mindlogicx Infratech Ltd., as a Technology Service Provider, follows the steps related to the digital evaluation of answer sheets as follows:-

"Process Flow for Digital Evaluation

Step 1: Receipt of Physical Answer Scripts

All sealed answer script bundles are formally received from the University at a designated secure facility located within the University premises. The receipt process is conducted strictly under the supervision of authorised University officials. Proper documentation, including acknowledgement, and reconciliation records to ensure traceability.

Step 2: Digitisation of Answer Scripts

The physical answer scripts are digitised using a secure and designated high-resolution scanning system installed exclusively at the secure facility within the University premises. Each script is scanned in its entirety to create an exact digital replica. No script is removed from the University premises during this process.

Step 3: Quality Check

Post-scanning, the digitised images undergo a multi-layered Quality Check (QC) process to ensure:

- *Completeness of pages*
- *Correct sequencing*

Any discrepancies identified during QC are immediately rectified through re-scanning. All quality assurance activities are conducted at the designated location within the University.

Step 4: Publishing for Evaluation (Two Levels Simultaneously)

After completion of quality checks, the digitised answer scripts are published simultaneously for two levels of evaluation and as per the configuration and rules defined by the University.

Step 5: Faculty Self-Allocation and Evaluation

Answer scripts are allocated to evaluators through the system in accordance with rules defined by the University.

Eligible evaluators access the system through secure authentication mechanism.

The Digital Evaluation enables the following key controls:

- *Masking of student identity to ensure anonymity.*
- *Different evaluators are assigned for each evaluation level.*
- *Question-wise marks capture in a structured format independent of the annotations.*
- *Maintenance of audit logs including login details, time stamps, and evaluation records.*

Step 6: Marks Consideration for Result Processing

As per University regulations, upon completion of both levels of evaluation, the system automatically identifies and considers the higher of the two marks awarded for each answer script for the purpose of result processing.

The entire marks compilation process is system-driven, eliminating manual intervention and minimising the possibility of human error.

Step 7: Handover of Scanned Answer Scripts

The scanned and evaluated answer scripts are formally handed over to the university as per the prescribed process.

On Screen Marking Process

1. That faculty, after logging in with their User ID and Password, can see the evaluation summary, which shows the maximum number of evaluations they are required to do and also shows the number of evaluations done by them and the number of evaluations left to be completed by them.

2. That evaluator, as per their convenience, can allocate an answer sheet from the cloud/server and after fetching the answer sheets from the cloud, the evaluator can start the evaluation process.

3. That after the answer sheet is made available on the evaluator system, the answer key is also made available (for reference) to the evaluator. However, the first page is masked, which ensures that the student is completely secured, making the system transparent and enabling transparent evaluation.

4. On the right side of the screen, a marks panel is provided in which the number of questions provided to the student in the allotted question paper is given, along with an input field where the evaluator has to enter question-wise marks manually. As a matter of fact, narration of every question is also provided on the screen for the reference of the evaluator.

5. That on the screen evaluator is being provided with annotations in the form of **Correct sign, Cross/wrong sign, correct & cross/wrong sign together, question mark & free hand.**

6. That evaluator is required to put an annotation on each and every page of the answer sheet. However, if the evaluator fails to put any annotation on any page, then the system will not permit the evaluator to submit the paper. This system is provided with the intent that the evaluator should go through each and every question before giving any marks. There is no correlation between the annotation and marks provided in the marks panel.

7. That system also provides the option of **freehand/pen**, which permits the evaluator to evaluate and add any comments on the screen digitally for the answer sheet in the traditional way as they are evaluating the answer sheets physically. It is pertinent to mention that by using the free hand/pen option, the evaluator can put a circle, write anything, put a correct sign, put a wrong/cross sign, can write a comment, can give marks or can use it in the same fashion as they are writing on a physical paper with the help of pen. However, the evaluator, despite annotating through a digital pen has to enter the marks obtained against a question number in a digital marks panel provided on the right-hand side of the screen; not doing so will not permit the evaluator to submit the answer sheet.

8. That system also gives the option of a dialogue box where the evaluator can write his/her comments against any answer. However, this option is more digital and can be used by those who do not want to use the digital pen option/free hand option.

6. The Mindlogicx software provides a choice while evaluating the answer sheets. It is upon the evaluator to use the option, where the evaluator can evaluate the answer sheet by using digital marking by using the way of using a touchscreen phone, computer, Desktop system, answer sheet can be evaluated by using dialog box without using a touchscreen pen also.

7. That software provides the option whereby using the mouse or using the fingertip, evaluator can evaluate the answer sheet. It is pertinent to mention that annotation signs are provided for the same purpose only. The system is designed in such a manner that at every stage and at every step, an option is provided to the evaluator to give his/her comments. However, the evaluator can give his/her final observation on the paper at the end of the evaluation after giving final marks also.

8. The evaluator can choose his/her method to evaluate the answer book, but to provide transparency and high efficiency in evaluating the answer sheet, the system is designed in such a manner that no answer can be left unmarked or cannot be left without evaluation. (A Copy of the screenshots of the entire process (stage by stage) is annexed here as **Annexure B**)"

10. To cross-check the veracity of the valuation done by digital mode, vis-à-vis the checking of the answer sheet by a physical mode i.e. conventional method, we directed the University to get the answer sheet of the petitioner of the above subject checked physically through a valuer. Today, the valuation done by a third valuer has been submitted in a sealed cover, and as per the valuation, the third valuer/expert, the petitioner secured only 23 marks out of 75. Therefore, there is no significant change even after the revaluation done by

the University in compliance of the court order, hence no relief is liable to be given to the petitioner, and the writ petition is liable to be dismissed on merit.

Facts of W.P. No.897/2026

11. In W.P. No.897/2026, the petitioner is a student of the BHMS course in Shivang Medical College and Hospital, Bhopal, affiliated with Madhya Pradesh Medical Science University. He appeared in the supplementary examination of the final year (M&S) in the subject of I Organon of Medicine with Homoeopathic Philosophy. Out of 200, in Theory I and Theory II, he scored 94, and in practice, he scored 68 out of 100. In total, he scored 162 and was given a compartment. In total, he scored 873 out of 1500. He applied for the supply of answer sheets and question papers under the RTI Act. The petitioner applied for re-valuation/re-checking, and thereafter filed a writ petition before this Court.

12. According to the petitioner, the answers to questions 2(k) and 3(D) were checked, and the examiner found them correct (✓), but no marks were awarded to him. In this matter, we also found that the answer sheet was scanned and digitally checked by the valuer. Therefore, this petition was tagged with the W.P. No.3091/2026, in order to verify whether the process adopted by the respondent university for checking the answer book by digital mode is correct or not.

13. In this petition also, the respondents Nos. 3 and 4/University have filed the reply explaining the system of digital evaluation of answer scripts.

Likewise, we have directed the University to get the answer sheet of the petitioner checked through independent valuers, and after valuation, he was given only 42 marks, which is fewer marks than the marks given by the original valuers. Therefore, there is no change. Hence, this writ petition has no substance, and the same is dismissed

14. Therefore, there is no flaw in the system of checking the answer sheets digitally through Outsourced agency. The answer sheets of both petitioners were correctly checked, and there is no scope of increase of the marks in it. Hence, the relief claimed by the petitioners for re-evaluation of the answer sheet and awarding more marks is totally misconceived. Accordingly, both the writ petitions are **dismissed** with costs of Rs. 5000/- to each of the petitioners, which shall be paid to the University for payment to the experts for reevaluation of answer sheets of the petitioners.

15. A copy of this order should be placed in the file of W.P. No.897/2026.

16. Before parting with this matter, we would like to suggest that Mindlogicx Infratech Ltd. add some more features to their evaluation process to fill the gap and make the system safer and more transparent.

GAPS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE SYSTEM

1. A Digital Fair Evaluation System (DFES) has been implemented for evaluating handwritten exam answers digitally, fairly, transparently, securely,

and faster. The objective of DFES is to address common issues in manual evaluation, such as inconsistent marking, delays, bias, lack of transparency, and tampering risks. The process starts with scanning of answer sheets and uploading, then evaluators use a digital marking interface with standardized symbols, comments, and rubrics to assess scripts. Why the confusion came to the mind of the petitioner because while checking the answers digitally, the valuer did not use the correct symbols. The answers were wrong, but symbols like [] were put and no marks were given. The valuer, although he filled in the zero marks in the table. In some correct answers, while checking, the valuer put [], and gave marks. By using a symbol [] or [], it cannot be asserted whether the entire answer was declared correct or wrong, or whether it was partially correct or wrong if full marks are not given. The digital checking should clearly show that which part of the answer is correct and which part is wrong, and how many numbers are given by the valuer, and this could be possible if the scanned answer sheet is checked by a pen on touch screen devices.

Here are our suggestions for the Mindlogicx Infratech Ltd: that the nature and range of symbols, comment formats, and rubric structures be clearly described. The valuer should use symbols like [] for a correct answer or [] for a wrong answer; if he is not using a pen on a touch screen Tab/ Computer. We strongly recommend that the checking and valuations of digitally scanned answer sheets/ books be done by using a pen on a touch screen device, in the

conventional way of checking, which will not create confusion in the minds of the students.

2. Common observation/gaps and suggestions to fill those gaps are as follows:-

S.No	Topic area	Observation/Gap identified	Suggestion
1	Marking tools & annotation types	The digital tool uses marking on the answer sheet via: Symbols, Comments, and Rubrics to assess scripts	Nature and range of symbols, comment formats, and rubric structures to be clearly described. The valuer should use symbols like [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] for a correct answer or [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] for a wrong answer; the valuer is not using a pen on a touch screen Tab/ Computer. We strongly recommend that the valuation be done by using a pen on a touch screen device, in a conventional way of checking, which will not create confusion in the minds of the students.
2	Input device/hardware used	Not clear whether evaluators use a desktop computer with a mouse or a touchscreen with a stylus/pencil for marking.	PDF editor provided to evaluators supports both mouse-based (desktop) and tablet/stylus (touchscreen) input modes. Preferably, tablets or touch screens with pen facility should be provided for the evaluation of the answer sheet.
3	Annotation layer integrity	Not clarified whether markings are written directly on the PDF or added as a separate overlay layer on top of the original document.	The original answer sheet PDF remains unaltered, and annotations exist on a distinct upper layer, ensuring the source document is preserved.
4	Document security mechanism	The type of security applied to documents is not described. No mention of the specific security mechanism(s) adopted.	Digital Signature, Blockchain-based verification, encryption, access controls, or a combination thereof, to be used for the security of documents.
5	Document Management System	Not clarified whether the PDF uploaded is stored and retrieved through DMS in an encrypted	The DMS should be used for the storage and retrieval of PDF documents. The department may consider open source DMS for preservation of

		format.	electronic records, like DSpace etc., an adopted mechanism defined in ISO standards 14721 and 16363.
--	--	---------	--

(VIVEK RUSIA)
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

(PRADEEP MITTAL)
JUDGE

ak