



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

LPA No.416 of 2025

Date of Decision: 10.02.2025

Pratibha Kaushik (Being Minor) & ors

...Appellants

Versus

Central Board of Secondary Education (C.B.S.E.) & ors

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present:- Mr. Sajal Bansal, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Beant Singh Seemar, Advocate
for respondents No.1 to 4.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

The appellants are students studying in Class 10th and 12th and challenged the order of respondents, dated 27.01.2025, whereby the examination centre has been shifted from their school where they were studying, to another centre alleging that the new centre provided for the 10th & 12th class is almost 27 kms away and it would be difficult for the students to appear for examinations at the said place.

2. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that it is a case where the school falls within the category of 'Single School Cities' as per Rules 33.1 & 33.2 and therefore, there is no occasion to shift the venue of examination from the said school to another school. The order passed on 05.02.2025 by learned Single Judge rejecting the claim, is challenged before us in the present LPA.

3. We have carefully considered the submissions and also gone through the rules and the judgment passed by learned Single Judge.



4. We find that the decision of fixing an examination centre is within the exclusive domain of the Board. There can be many circumstances on account of which an examination centre already provided may be shifted. It can be on account of the reasons of chances of mass cheating which are on the basis of feedback and the Board may take a decision to shift. There can be also other reasons, like improper facilities or immediate disturbance which may be on account of certain local situations which may arise on account of strike, functions etc. We need not go into those reasons at all as judicial review with regard to administrative actions is only in cases where we find that a decision is of such a nature which no ordinary person would in normal circumstances take.

Learned Single Judge has already made observations in Para No.7 as under:-

“7. In case, the petitioners-students feels that they need a transport facility which can be provided by the State so as to facilitate the minor students in appearing for the examination, the petitioners are free to move an appropriate representation before the Deputy Commissioner, Panchkula, who will consider the same and in case, the Deputy Commissioner, Panchkula is of the view that the Government transport facility can be given to them for appearing in the examination, the same be allowed in a manner required.”

5. We confer and find no reason to interfere with the order passed by learned Single Judge. The present appeal is dismissed.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

10.02.2025
neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No