

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

**BEFORE**

**HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE ANAND PATHAK  
&  
HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR VANI**

**ON THE 9<sup>th</sup> OF JULY, 2025**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 25508 of 2025**

**KUMAR PANCHJANYA**

**Vs.**

**UNION OF INDIA & ORS.**

---

**APPEARANCE:**

*Shri Sameer Kumar Shrivastava – Advocate for the petitioner.*

*Shri Praveen Kumar Newaskar – Dy. Solicitor General for respondents No.1&3/UOI.*

*Shri Chetan Kanoongo – Advocate for respondent No.2.*

*Professor Shri Raghunath Tiwari from IIT Kanpur present in person.*

---

**ORDER**

1. The present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution is preferred by the petitioner seeking following reliefs:

*“i. A writ of mandamus may kindly be issued directing Respondent no. 2 and 3 to reconcile the scores i.e conduct a score normalization exercise; to match the score he would likely have achieved without unforeseen interruption during the second exam of JEE (Advanced) for paper number 2 which was conducted on 18 May 2025 between 2:30 to 5:30 PM.*

*ii. An appropriate order or direction may kindly be issued directing the respondent no. 2 and 3 to consider the marks*

*obtained by petitioner in JEE(Mains) as bench mark of his JEE (Advanced) examination and accordingly grant him to same marks.*

*iii. A writ of mandamus and or certiorari may kindly be issued directing the respondent no.4 to preserve and produce CCTV footage the 2<sup>nd</sup> session of the exam which petitioner appeared in on 18th may 2025 and directing to conduct an independent inquiry in to the lapses at the examination center.*

*Any other relief which this Hon'ble High Court deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the case may also kindly be granted."*

2. It is grievance of petitioner who happens to be an IIT aspirant that during examination of JEE (Advanced), respondents allotted malfunctioning computer and mouse which was continuously lagging, flickering and unresponsive due to which petitioner is adversely affected and this adversely impacted the performance of the petitioner. Therefore, much time consumed. Particulars of this timing is as under:

Examination started at 2:30 pm and had ended at 5:30 pm. Period of glitch was as under:

From 2:47 pm till 2:54 pm (7 minutes)

From 3:03 pm till 3:05 pm (2 minutes)

From 3:12 pm till 3:14 pm (2 minutes)

3. In short petitioner had to undergo 11 minutes of malfunctioning/technical glitch. Therefore, petitioner was mentally disturbed. He made a representation to respondents No.2 and 3 and they directed the petitioner to contact concerned authority. Therefore,

this petition is preferred.

4. It is the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner that his case be directed to be considered by the respondents sympathetically and if any leniency is shown then he may be given some extra marks.
5. Learned counsel for the respondents opposed the prayer. Counsel for respondent No.2 Shri Chetan Kanoongo on the basis of instruction received from Professor Raghunath Tiwari (from IIT Kanpur), fairly submits that for regular students examination ended at 5:30 pm but petitioner was given 15 minutes extra, meaning thereby his examination ended at 5:45 pm to cover up the technical glitch. He is a bright student and he performed more than national average as compared to JEE (Mains) *vis a vis* JEE (Advanced). He got one seat at IIT Kharagpur. Therefore, at this stage, nothing more can be done. Respondent No.2 fairly submits that additional marks in view of the extra time given, cannot be awarded to the petitioner.
6. Heard.
7. After considering the rival submission and going through the relief claimed, it appears that petitioner was given 15 minutes extra for the technical glitch /malfunctioning he suffered. However, still he fared well, therefore, so far as extra time is concerned, it appears that it was given to the sufficient extent. Although a practical aspect of this malfunctioning must be haunting the petitioner to the extent where malfunctioning at times create mental anxiety and at such important examination this malfunctioning may result into compromised mental faculty of student who is appearing in the examination. Therefore, all these technical glitches and malfunctioning are required to be avoided at any cost.
8. So far as grant of additional marks are concerned it is the domain of

respondents. Court cannot substitute any pattern other than the prescribed one. Respondents may consider the representation of petitioner in accordance with law. Else petitioner is already in a better institute (IIT Kharagpur) with long drawn legacy and fame.

9. Petition stands **disposed of** with aforesaid observations.

Anil\*

**(ANAND PATHAK)**  
**JUDGE**

**(RAJENDRA KUMAR VANI)**  
**JUDGE**