

31.08.2026.
Court No.13
Item No. 5
ap

M.A.T. 1332 of 2026
With
I.A. No. CAN 1 of 2026

Shaonkali Maji
Versus
The Union of India & Ors.

Mr. Ranjan Bachawat, ld. Sr. Advocate,
Mr. Sarosij Dasgupta,
Mr. Bikramjit Mandal,
Mr. Sagnik Bose.

...For the appellant.

Mr. U. S. Menon,
Mr. Abhirup Chakraborty.

...For the respondent nos.3, 4 & 5.

Mr. Anil Kumar Gupta,
Mr. Madan Mohan Ray.

...For the UOI.

1. The instant intra court appeal is directed against the order dated 31st July, 2026 passed by a learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.A 18423 of 2026.

2. The writ petitioner/appellant had contended before the learned Single Judge and this Court that she had participated in the NEET (UG), 2026 examination and was shown to have secured 146 marks. OMR Sheet was sent to the writ petitioner by National Testing Agency (in short NTA) by an electronic mail dated 15th July, 2025 late in the evening. The window for raising disputes and grievances against the OMR evaluation was between 13th July, 2026 and 15th July, 2026 upto 11 A.M.

3. It is after receipt of the electronic mail from the NTA at about 10:30 P.M. on 15th July, 2026 that the petitioner raised a grievance on the next date in the

morning that OMR sheet sent by NTA was not her's. She pointed out that several questions left blank by her appear to have answered in the OMR sheet. The answers given to some questions were also altered.

4. Counsel for the appellant, therefore, contends that the OMR answer sheet of some other candidate was sent to the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner has missed the window of raising disputes against the OMR sheet because she has received the electronic mail only on 15th July, 2026 that too at about 10:30 P.M.

5. This Court, however, notes that as many as about 20,00,000 candidates from all over the country, participated in the NEET, 2026 Examination. The said examination was conducted after the earlier NEET was scraped due to paper leaks.

6. While it is true that NTA is entrusted with the responsibility of conducting NEET examination and to ensure complete transparency and seamlessness, one must also factor in the volume of the work entrusted to the NTA.

7. What strikes to this Court as a serious omission on the part of the appellant/writ petitioner is that the NTA had notified to all the participants that they are to visit the website of NTA where all the OMR sheets of all the candidates were available between 13th July, 2026 and 15th July, 2026.

8. The writ petitioner admittedly waited for an electronic mail from NTA until late evening of 15th

July, 2026. The writ petitioner has admittedly not visited the website of NTA between 13th and 15th July, 2026.

9. In the light of the above, this Court is of the view that it does not lie in the mouth of the petitioner to rely upon OMR sheet sent to her by the NTA on the night of 15th July, 2026 to contend that she did not get an opportunity to challenge the same. The writ petitioner has been rather casual in pursuing her career. She was negligent in not visiting the NTA website between 13th and 15th July, 2026.

10. In the light of the above, this Court finds that the writ petitioner is not entitled to any relief and the writ petition was rightly dismissed by the learned Single Judge.

11. For the reasons stated hereinabove, M.A.T. 1332 of 2026 fails and is hereby dismissed.

12. In view of dismissal of the appeal itself, the connected application being CAN 1 of 2026 is also dismissed.

13. There will be no order as to costs.

14. All parties are directed to act on a server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

(Rajasekhar Mantha, J.)

(Anuj Singh, J.)