



1

WP-24852-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT INDORE

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PAVAN KUMAR DWIVEDI

ON THE 10th OF JULY, 2026WRIT PETITION No. 24852 of 2026*VIJAY RATHOD**Versus**THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS*

.....
Appearance:

Shri Dinesh Singh Chauhan - Advocate for the petitioner through VC.

Shri Pradhuman Malpani - Panel Lawyer for the respondent/State.

.....

ORDER

The petitioner has filed this present petition being aggrieved by the action of the respondent in as much as after holding examination for recruitment on the post of Police Constable vide Recruitment Test-2025, the final key was altered without assigning any reason and without issuing any notice to the candidates whose answers were correct according to the unamended answer key.

2. It is stated that when the petitioner came to know about the same, he tried to raise objection before the respondents, however as no link to the online process was available, the representations of the petitioner are not being accepted by the concerned authority and the petitioner without being heard has been ousted from the process of selection as a consequence of change in the final answer key, he has missed the cut off for selection by 0.34 marks.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the earlier recruitment process also same incident has occurred pursuant to which several persons filed petitions before this Court which were decided by common order in case of *Arpit Sahu & Ors. vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh & Ors. in W.P.No.*



20332/2025 (and connected matters) vide order dated 10.12.2025 (Jabalpur) and also in a different bunch in case of *Neeraj Mishra & Ors. vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh & Ors.* in W.P.No. 26416/2024 vide order dated 10.12.2025 as well as in case of *Jitendra Rajput vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh & Ors.* in Writ Petition No. 26558/2023 dated 13.12.2025 and respondents were directed to take steps accordingly. Learned counsel thus submits that in the present case also, similar direction deserves to be issued considering the fact that only for the reason of change in the final answer key, the petitioner has missed his selection.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the State submits that modification in the answer key is based on the expert opinion thus, no interference in the same is warranted.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties. Perused the case file.

6. This Court while passing the order dated 10.12.2025 in the case of *Arpit Sahu (supra)* has observed in para 10 as under :

"10. Thus, petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent No.3 to consider the objections submitted by the petitioners and do the modification in the model answer key (if objections are found correct) and grant appropriate marks accordingly, thereafter, prepare the revised merit list and communicate the same to the respondent No.2. As the order is being passed in the absence of selectees, this is also directed to respondent No.3 to issue notice to all the selectees to submit their objections before modification in the model answer key and then prepare revised merit list on the basis of modified answer key. The said list then be forwarded to respondent No.1 and 2 for preparation of fresh selection list. The aforesaid exercise be done within 15 days from today till then the respondent No.1 and 2 are directed not to proceed with the appointment process."

7. Again in the case of *Neeraj Mishra (supra)*, the Court directed thus in para 8 and 9 :



"8. In view of the observation made by the Full Bench, the matter deserves to be relegated to the expert body, as the cases of the petitioners have not been considered because of the expiry of the link after taking one objection. Thus, petitions are disposed of with direction to the petitioners to re-submit the objection. For that purpose, the entire memo of petition be placed before the respondents within seven days from today for expert opinion. In turn, the respondents are directed that the objection raised by the petitioners shall be decided within a further period of one month from the date of receipt of the objection.

9. It is further observed that if any of the answers are found to be not correct by the experts then the respondents shall not take any action against the persons, who have prepared the model answer key for fair and independent decision by the experts."

8. In view of the above law as laid down by this Court, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents No. 3 and 4 to let the petitioner submit his objections against the change in the final answer key and take decision as per the direction given by this Court in the above referred cases.

9. With the aforesaid, the present petition stands **disposed of** however, with a clarification that this Court has not opined anything on the merits of the case.

(PAVAN KUMAR DWIVEDI)
JUDGE

vidya