



\$~127

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 5904/2025 & CM APPL 26907/2025**

ANUSHA GUPTA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Deepak Jain, Ms. Jaspreet Aulakh, Ms. Anoushka Singh, Ms. Dashampreet Kaur, Mr. Sajal Gupta and Mr. Aksh Raina, Advocates.

versus

**NATIONAL TESTING AGENCY (THROUGH THE DIRECTOR)
& ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rupesh Kumar, Senior Advocate with Mr. Sanjay Khanna, Standing Counsel with Ms. Pankhuri Srivastava, Mr. Alekshendra Sharma, Ms. Pragya Bhushan, Mr. Tarandeep Singh, Ms. Vilakshana Dayma and Mr. Aditya Kumar, Advocates for NTA.

Ms. Neha Rastogi, Sr. Panel Counsel with Mr. Animesh Ratogi and Mr. Rajat Dubey Advocates for R2 and R3.

Mr. Arjun Mitra, Advocate for JEE (Advance), IIT Kanpur.

Ms. Aastha Gupta, Govt. Pleader with Mr. Manish Kapoor, Ms. Kiran Bharti and Ms. Parul Mittal, Advocates for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

14.05.2025

CM APPL. 28928/2025 (by petitioners for condonation of delay of 03 days in filing electronic records)

1. The present application has been filed by the petitioners seeking



condonation of delay of 03 days in filing electronic record *vide* order dated 06.05.2025.

2. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the delay of 03 days is condoned.

3. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 5904/2025 and CM APPL. Nos. 26906/2025 (interim relief)

4. Mr. Deepak Jain, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner at the outset submits that he is not pressing the present petition insofar as petitioner no. 3 is concerned. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed as withdrawn *qua* petitioner no. 3.

5. The petitioner nos. 1 and 2 herein are the students, who had appeared in JEE (Mains) 2025. The case set out by the petitioners in the present petition is that JEE (Main)-2025 had been conducted by the National Testing Agency ('NTA') in two parts i.e. Session I and Session II. The grievance articulated is that the final score card of the petitioner nos. 1 and 2 in respect of Session I has been manipulated.

6. It is the case of petitioner no.1 that the result was declared by the NTA for Session I on 11.02.2025 and the score card (Annexure P/4) which she accessed from the NTA's website at about 17:58:16 on the said date itself, showed that she has scored 98.6874923 percentile. However, after she had taken the Session II of JEE (Main) Examination-2025, a composite result was declared by the NTA, and composite score card (Annexure P/5) showed that she had scored only 25.5874923 percentile in Session I and 49.8010719 percentile in Session II.

7. It is further the case of petitioner no.1 that she had not only



downloaded her score card of Session I, but her response sheet (Annexure P/3) as well, from the website of the respondent no.1/NTA. Thereafter, the petitioner no.1 claims to have approached the higher authorities at the office of respondent no.1/NTA and obtained a hard copy of her response sheet (Annexure P/7) after release of the final composite result. The said response sheet does not tally with the one downloaded previously.

8. Likewise, the case set out on behalf of the petitioner no.2 is that he viewed his score card (Annexure P/4) for Session I on 11.02.2025 at 20:17:39 and the same was downloaded on 12.02.2025 at 06:07 am. A perusal of the said score card shows that the petitioner has scored 94.8107035 percentile, however, the composite score card (Annexure P/5) shows that the petitioner has only scored 80.4107035 percentile in Session I.

9. Further, the petitioner no.2 has also alleged irregularity with regard to his attempt in Session II as well, wherein after completion of the examination, a pop-up message appeared indicating the attempted and un-attempted questions of the petitioner no.2. However, when the response sheet was downloaded by him for Session II from the website of respondent no.1/NTA, he discovered that the number of questions attempted were switched with the number of un-attempted questions as shown in the pop-up message.

10. Mr. Jain contends that petitioner no.1's downloaded score card for Session I, as well as the response sheet for the same Session, are available in her laptop in unedited form. Similarly, petitioner no.2's downloaded score card of Session I and composite score card, are available in two separate laptops. He submits that the petitioners have brought their laptops in the Court today.



11. He further submits that, pursuant to the directions given by this Court *vide* order dated 06.05.2025, petitioners have also placed on record the pen drive in a sealed cover which as per application being CM APPL. 28929/2025 contains the following electronic contents:

Electronic contents submitted by petitioner no.1

- i) Browser history/logs records access, and download of the Score Card for Session 1 on 11.02.2025.*
- ii) Browser history/ logs records, screenshots access and download of the Score Card for Session 2 on 18.04.2025.*
- iii) File properties including Date, Time and metadata of the download of the Response Sheet for Session 1 on 04.02.2025.*
- iv) Screenshot of file properties including Date, Time and metadata of the Scorecard for Session 1, downloaded on 11.02.2025.*
- v) File Properties including Date, Time and metadata of the Scorecard for Session 2, downloaded on 18.04.2025.*
- vi) Browser Path of Browsing history downloaded “forever”, i.e., default last 90 days.*

Electronic contents submitted by petitioner no.2

- i) Browser logs record download of Session 1 Scorecard on 11.02.2025.*
- ii) Browser logs of the father of the Petitioner No. 2 showing access to the Session 2 scorecard.*
- iii) Screenshot of file properties/metadata including Date, Time of the Scorecards of both Session 1 (in student’s laptop) and Session 2 (in student’s father’s laptop).*



*iv) Browser Path of Browsing history downloaded “forever”,
i.e., default last 90 days.*

12. The contention of Mr. Jain is that the score cards of the petitioners have been manipulated as the score cards of Session I which were downloaded by petitioners initially are no more available on the website of NTA, instead the allegedly manipulated score cards with incorrect scores have been uploaded.

13. Mr. Rupesh Kumar, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.1/NTA submits that there is no manipulation in the score card. In fact, the score cards were also sent through e-mails to both the petitioners. He further contends that it is the respondent no.2/NIC which uploads the score cards. Further, NIC has certified that there is no manipulation in the score cards as well as the response sheets. He further places reliance on the audit logs, a copy of which has been placed on record along with the counter-affidavit. The respondent no.1/NTA has also handed over a pen drive in terms of the order dated 06.05.2025 in as sealed cover, the said pen drive is also taken on record.

14. Be that as it may, both the parties are *ad idem* that to find out the truth of the matter, it is imperative to refer the matter to the experts. Accordingly, the matter is referred to the Central Forensic Science Laboratory (CFSL), CBI, Kendriya Karyalaya Parisar, CGO Complex, 4th Floor, Block No.4, Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003 for the purpose of ascertaining the following:

i. Whether the original score cards and the response sheet relied upon by the petitioners, which were downloaded by them on their respective systems (laptops), were so downloaded from the official website of the NTA?



- ii. Are there any traces of tampering (like metadata alterations, edits or inconsistencies in timestamps, author, source etc.) in the digital documents after the same were downloaded in the aforementioned laptops?
- iii. Whether the e-mail containing the score cards of the candidates stated to be forwarded by the NTA on 12.02.2025 and 13.02.2025 after declaration of results of JEE (Main) Session I, 2025 were received and accessed by the candidates from their registered e-mail addresses?
- iv. Any other information/inputs that is useful to decide the controversy articulated above?

15. The details of three laptops which were used for accessing the disputed score cards and the response sheet are as under:

Details	Laptop of Petitioner no.1	Laptop of Petitioner no.2	Laptop of father of Petitioner no.2
Device name	Anusha	DESKTOP-7047UDC	1BC1SL2
Device ID	F25D35B1-84D8-4447-B27F-56921226201C	EBF41653-6F1F-453D-BCE7-221C2B2FDB13	DECD8D20-1D7E-4E34-BA6B-EB70E6C3E76F
Make	DELL	DELL	DELL
Colour	BLACK	BLACK	SILVER

16. The aforesaid three laptops will be handed over by the petitioners to the Court Master at 4.30 p.m. today for being sealed, in their presence.

17. The Registry is directed to forward the three sealed laptops to CFSL, New Delhi alongwith hard copies of the following annexures as mentioned in the table below:

S.No.	Annexure Number	Details
1.	Annexure P/3	Original response sheet downloaded by petitioner no.1.
2.	Annexure P/4	Original score cards downloaded by the petitioners.
3.	Annexure P/5	Composite score cards downloaded by the petitioners.
4.	Annexure P/7	Copy of physical response sheet received by



		petitioner no.1 from the office of NTA.
5.	Annexure R-1/1	Documents relied upon by NTA pertaining to petitioner no.1 including score cards, response sheets, e-mail dated 13.02.2025 and the logs.
6.	Annexure R-1/2	Documents relied upon by NTA pertaining to petitioner no.2 including score cards, response sheets, e-mail dated 12.02.2025 and the logs.

18. The NTA has placed reliance on hard copies of the audit logs as well as on the score card and the response sheets pertaining to the petitioners, claiming the same to be the genuine one. Let NTA furnish soft copies of these documents in pen drive to the Registry for forensic analysis, within two days, to enable the CFSL to answer the queries formulated in para 14 above.

19. The petitioners are directed to furnish their respective registered e-mail IDs to the Registry for verification by the CFSL. Likewise, the petitioners will also furnish their mobile numbers to the Registry. Let this be done within two days.

20. The Registry will send all the documents/details mentioned in para 18 and 19 to CFSL, alongwith those mentioned in para 11 (pen drive given by the petitioners), and para 17 read with para 15 above, after sealing the same in a packet. The parties and their learned counsel are requested to co-ordinate with the Registry.

21. In case the CFSL, New Delhi requires any material, information or assistance, it may contact the petitioners on their mobile numbers.

22. The Director, CFSL, New Delhi is requested to expedite the investigation and furnish a report in a sealed cover on or before 22.05.2025 in view of the urgency, since the result of JEE (Advanced)-2025 will be declared on 02.06.2025. Needless to say, that any finding, or information



received during the period of investigation, shall not be disclosed by the CFSL, New Delhi to any of the parties as the same might be of sensitive nature.

23. It is not in dispute that the petitioner no.2 is eligible for JEE (Advanced) on the basis of the percentile in the disputed score card (Annexure P/4). The last date for making an application for JEE (Advanced) was 02.05.2025, however, considering the peculiar facts and circumstances noted hereinabove, petitioner is permitted to register his application for JEE (Advanced). Respondent no.4/JEE (Advanced) is requested to process the said application.

24. Mr. Arjun Mitra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.4/JEE (Advanced) is also requested to ensure the smooth processing of petitioner no.2's application for JEE (Advanced) Examination.

25. In case of any necessity, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner no.2 is at liberty to contact Mr. Mitra and follow up the matter with him.

26. It is clarified that the interim directions given hereinabove shall be subject to the outcome of the present writ petition and the same shall not create any special equities in favour of petitioner no.2. It is further directed that the result of petitioner no.2 in JEE (Advanced) will not be declared and the same will be placed before this Court in a sealed cover.

27. Insofar as petitioner no.1 is concerned, similar interim directions are not warranted as she has not secured 75% marks in the qualifying examination i.e. the Senior Secondary Level.

28. List on 23.05.2025 in supplementary list.

29. A copy of this order be given *dasti* under the signatures of the Court



Master.

CM APPL. 28929/2025 (by petitioners seeking to place on record electronic documents)

30. The application is allowed and the electronic record is taken on record.

31. The present application stands disposed of.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

MAY 14, 2025/jg