



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN  
BENCH AT JAIPUR**

D.B. Review Petition (Writ) No.106/2022

In

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.1347/2022

Sudarshan Purohit

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Hon'ble High Court For Judicature Of Rajasthan,  
Through Registrar General, Jodhpur.

2. The Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court,  
Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

---

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Vinod Lal Mathur, Advocate

---

**HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE MR. MANINDRA MOHAN SHRIVASTAVA  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAMEER JAIN**

**Order**

**28/04/2022**

Heard on prayer for review of order dated 08.04.2022  
passed by this Court.

Learned counsel for the review petitioner would submit that  
insofar as decision of the respondent examination agency and  
expert body to alter the model answer of question no.A-66/B-  
49/C-58/D-39, the same was palpably wrong because the  
Indecent Representation of Women (Prohibition) Act, 1986 was  
published on 25.09.1987.

The next submission is that model answer once framed could  
not be altered. It is further submitted that the petitioner having



answered the earlier model answer ought to have been benefited with the marks as the very alteration of model answers was incorrect.

In support of his submission, he has relied upon the judgments in the case of **Kanpur University, through Vice Chancellor and Others Versus Samir Gupta and Others: (1983) 4 SCC 309, Manish Ujwal and Others Versus Maharishi Dayanand Saraswati University and Others: (2005) 13 SCC 744** and **Ran Vijay Singh and Others Versus State of U.P. and Others: (2018) 2 SCC 357.**

The argument of learned counsel for the review petitioner is utterly misconceived in law. This Court on the factual premise that upon objection received on the correctness of the model answer key of question no.A-66/B-49/C-58/D-39, the expert body had considered objection and it opined that the question was with regard to the date on which the Act was published and therefore with reference to the question, the date of publication was relevant not the date on which it was brought into force and effect in exercise of powers under Section 1(1) of the Act. This decision of the expert body, in our opinion, does not suffer from any illegality or perversity. The judgments which have been relied upon by the learned counsel for the review petitioner are with regard to the scope of interference by the constitutional courts in the matter of correctness of model answers. The procedure adopted by the respondents to invite objections against proposed answer keys, getting it examined by a body of experts and acting according to the opinion of experts, has been found by this Court to be in accordance with law calling for no interference.



The review petition being misconceived is, therefore, dismissed.

(SAMEER JAIN),J

(MANINDRA MOHAN SHRIVASTAVA),ACTING CJ

Karan/3



RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT



सत्यमेव जयते