



207

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.15106-2025(O&M)

Date of decision: 30.07.2025

GURSHAAN SINGH CHEEMA

... PETITIONER

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

... RESPONDENTS

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

Present:- Mr. Prashant Kumar Kapila, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anil Chawla, Senior Panel Counsel
for respondent No.1 UOI.

Mr. Arun Gosain, Advocate for respondent No.2, NTA.

Mr. Hemen Aggarwal, Advocate and Dashim Garg, Advocate for
respondent No.3 UGC.

SANJIV BERRY, J.

1. The instant writ petition has been preferred by the petitioner assailing the correctness of the final answer key to the Common University Entrance Test- Postgraduate for Political Science subject (hereinafter referred to as 'CUET (PG)-2025') for Central Universities, State Universities and other Participating Universities/Institutions/Organizations, conducted by National Testing Agency (hereinafter referred to as 'NTA') respondent No.2, an autonomous body under the Ministry of Education, Government of India



which has been entrusted for the conducting of such Examination by the University Grants Commission (UGC) respondent No.3.

2. The case put forth by the petitioner pursuing graduation from the Panjab University is that he had applied for Common University Entrance Test-Postgraduate for Political Science subject (CUET-PG) to be conducted by NTA and had appeared in the examination on 25.03.2025. The provisional answer key was published on 22.04.2025 (Annexure P/5A) and was shocked to find the answer to question ID No. 7311302427 (hereinafter referred to as 'disputed question'). It is contended that the petitioner had answered the said question with "Option 1(Answer Id 7311305693)" correctly, whereas, the Provisional Answer Key reflected the answer as "Option 2 (Answer Id 7311305694)" which is manifestly wrong. He submits that the career of the petitioner would be jeopardized due to evaluation by the NTA on the basis of incorrect answer key, hence the writ petition.

3. Upon notice, respondent No.2-NTA filed reply by way of counter affidavit with the correct answer. As per the NTA's final answer key the correct answer is "Option 2 (Answer Id 7311305694)" on the ground that subject experts had interpreted the term "**chronological**" in the disputed question, in the context of **effect on the federal structure and political development**, as such, no change was warranted, hence prayed for dismissal of the present writ petition.

4. Learned counsel for the parties have been heard.

5. Undisputedly, the petitioner had appeared in the CUET-PG 2025 conducted on 25.03.2025 vide admit card (Annexure P-4). His result was declared vide scorecard (Annexure P-13). On the publication of the



Provisional Answer Key on 22.04.2025, petitioner had challenged the answer key to the disputed question, bearing Id No. 7311302427. However in the final answer key the same answer was mentioned as incorrect and based thereon, the result of the test was declared and the scorecard of the petitioner dated 06.05.2025 (Annexure P/13) was issued.

6. Before proceeding further a glance at the disputed question bearing ID No. 7311302427 shows that the question as well as the options given in the test, is as under:-

“Arrange the following amendments to the Constitution in a chronological order:

A. Incorporation of Dadra and Nagar Haveli as Union Territory

B. Abolition of Election Tribunals

C. Abolition of Privy Purse

D. Reducing the age of voting rights from 21 to 18 year

1.	<i>A,B,C,D</i>	<i>Answer Id</i>	<i>ID No. 7311305693</i>
2.	<i>A,C,B,D</i>	<i>Answer Id</i>	<i>ID No. 7311305694</i>
3.	<i>B,A,D,C</i>	<i>Answer Id</i>	<i>ID No. 7311305695</i>
4.	<i>C,B,D,A</i>	<i>Answer Id</i>	<i>ID No. 7311305696”</i>

7. As per the Provisional Answer Key, the correct answer was “Option 2 (A,C, B,D)”, whereas, according to petitioner he had responded “Option 1(A,B,C,D)” as correct answer.

8. The response of the NTA to this in its reply had been that the correct answer as per the NTA’s final answer key is “Option 2 (A,C, B,D)” which was retained after rigorous academic review by independent subject



experts and the same was based on the expert analysis of how constitutional amendments and their operational implementation could be ‘chronologically’ interpreted and it was stated that while the standard legislative records suggest the order “A (1961), B(1966), C(1971), D(1989)” as strictly chronological in terms of the year of enactment but however the subject experts had interpreted the term **“chronological” in the context of effect on the federal structure and political development”**.

9. The perusal of record reveals that the petitioner had answered the aforesaid disputed question with answer as “Option 1(A,B,C,D).”

10. The disputed question is “to arrange all the amendments (A,B,C,D) in the Constitution in a Chronological order”.

11. Undoubtedly, the amendments in the Constitution at serial No. A,B,C,D were enacted in the year 1961, 1966, 1971, 1989 respectively and by arranging these enactments in a chronological order the correct answer had to be “Option 1 (A,B,C,D)”, strictly in accordance with the chronological order of the year of enactment, when the said constitutional amendments were carried out. The petitioner had attempted “Option 1 (A,B,C,D)” as correct answer which in the considered opinion of this Court is the correct answer qua the chronological order of the aforesaid enactments in the Constitution. The explanation given by the respondent NTA regarding their subject experts having interpreted the term chronological in the context of effect on the federal structure and political development appears to be hyper technical and not in consonance with the simple language of the disputed question “*viz. arrange the following amendments to the Constitution in a chronological order*”. In the disputed question it was nowhere required



therein “for arranging the chronological order in the context of the effect on the federal structure and political development” and hence there was no occasion for the candidate to have answered so in terms of the concept which was in the mind of the subject expert which was nowhere reflected in black and white in the question paper itself.

12. Thus, considering all these aspects, this Court is of considered view that answer “**Option 1 (A,B,C,D) Answer Id ID No. 7311305693**” given by the petitioner of the disputed question is correct in the terms of plain reading thereof, therefore, the petitioner is entitled to get credit thereof in the scorecard.

13. Accordingly, this petition is hereby disposed of, thereby directing the respondent No.2 to consider the answer “**Option 1 (A,B,C,D) Answer Id ID No. 7311305693**” to the aforesaid disputed question, bearing ID No. 7311302427, as attempted by the petitioner, to be correct answer and award him the weightage thereof, by rectifying his result and issue afresh his scorecard within a period of 15 days from the receipt of copy of this order.

14. The writ petition is disposed of in above terms.

15. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Dated: 30.07.2025

Gyan

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No