

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE JUDICATURE FOR
RAJASTHANAT JAIPUR BENCH,
JAIPUR**

S. B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION (M) NO. / 2018

1. Aeshita Singh D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
2. Kriti Agarwal D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
3. Kanu Priya Tiwari D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
4. Rachit Sharma, S/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
5. Nikhil Aman, S/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
6. Diksha Chaudhary D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
7. Robin Rathi, S/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
8. Kamal Jamal Puriya, S/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
9. Sakshi Mehta, D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
10. Akash Meena, S/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
11. Siddhi Jain, D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
12. Divya Surana, D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED],
[REDACTED]
13. Yashoda Mandowara D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
14. Harshit Darak S/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED] years, R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

15. Abhishek Sharma, S/o [REDACTED] Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]

16. Avisha Agarwal D/o [REDACTED] Age-[REDACTED] R/o [REDACTED]

.....Petitioners/ Defendants

Vs

1. CLAT 2018- Working Committee

Through its Convenor, Prof. (Dr.) Rose Varghese
National University of Advanced Legal Studies (NUALS),
Medical College - NAD Rd, HMT Colony, North Kalamassery,
Kalamassery, Kochi, Kerala 683503 ...Respondent No. 1

2. CLAT 2018 - Implementation Committee

Through its Chairman, Prof. (Dr.) Rose Varghese
National University of Advanced Legal Studies (NUALS),
Medical College - NAD Rd, HMT Colony, North Kalamassery,
Kalamassery, Kochi, Kerala 683503

...Respondent No. 2

3. The National University of Advanced Legal Studies

Through its Vice Chancellor, Medical College - NAD Rd, HMT
Colony, North Kalamassery, Kalamassery, Kochi, Kerala 683503

...Respondent No. 3

.....Respondents

**S.B CIVIL WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND 227
OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA HIGHLIGHTING
WIDESPREAD DISCREPANCIES AND MALPRACTICES
FACED BY PETITIONERS IN CONDUCTION OF COMMON
LAW ADMISSION TEST (CLAT)-2018 AND SEEKING AN
ENQUIRY INTO AFFAIRS OF CLAT 2018 AND SEEKING RE
EXAMINATION OF CLAT 2018.**

AND

**IN THE MATTER OF VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 14, 19 AND 21
OF CONSITUTION AND FAILURE OF DUTY CAST UPON
RESPONDENTS TO CONDUCT CLAT 2018 EXAMINATION IN
A FREE, FAIR AND EFFICIENT MANNER.**

TO,

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND HIS OTHER
COMPANION JUDGES OF THE RAJASTHAN HIGH
COURT, JAIPUR BENCH AT JAIPUR.**

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR LORDSHIPS:

THE PETITIONERS HUMBLY SUBMIT AS UNDER:

1. That the Petitioners are citizens of India and therefore entitled to invoke the extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India.
2. That every year, more than 50,000 students write the prestigious Common Law Admission Test, 2018 across various centres, for the purpose of securing admission to the top national law universities of this country.
3. That CLAT was first conducted in the year 2008, and since then its popularity, and interest of students for securing admission to integrated 5 year law courses and LLM Courses in increasing.
4. That each year, every other national law university, in order of their year of establishment, conducts CLAT 2018, and this

year the task was entrusted to Respondent No. 3, i.e. National University of Advanced Legal Studies, Kochi.

5. That it was therefore, looking to the repute of the examination and considering the number of students, who write it each year, incumbent upon the organizing university of CLAT, 2018, Respondent No.3, to make sure the exam is organized in the most efficient and hassle free manner.
6. That Petitioners no. 1 to 16 prepared for CLAT 2018 for one whole year and thereafter submitted their application form, after which they were given their admit card. True Copy of Admit Cards of Petitioner No 1 to 16 is annexed herewith and marked as **ANNEXURE-1(Colly) (pg to)**
7. That it is pertinent to mention here that on the admit card of students, online test instructions are specifically mentioned. One of instructions is as under:
"17-In the event of the examination being disrupted for technical reasons, the candidate should immediately inform the invigilator. The timer would automatically stop and the invigilator will help the candidate to re-login the examination. This will start the examination timer from where it had stopped."

Copy of online test instruction issued by Respondents is annexed with and marked as **ANNEXURE-2 (pg to)**

8. That it is most respectfully submitted before this Hon'ble Court that CLAT 2018, was conducted across various cities on 13.05.2018 in the most mismanaged, unorganized and inefficient manner, due to the present petitioners have

suffered irreparable loss affecting their career and future prospects severely.

9. That further, the exam was conducted online with a lot of technical errors resulting in loss of precious time of applicant petitioners which has hampered their scores in the examination.
10. That Petitioner No. 1, Ms. Aeshita Singh appeared for the exam at Vivekanand Institute of Technology, Jaipur on the said day after preparing for one whole year fully for the exam hoping to do her best but she witnesses the following irregularities during the said exam because of which she was not able to attempt the paper in a smooth manner:
 - Once the exam started she lost around 11 minutes due to questions not appearing on screen, when she brought this to invigilator's attention, he himself was so clueless and untrained and he told her that she won't get extra time, due to which many candidates including got shocked.
 - Throughout the paper, the screen kept freezing and mouse didn't work properly and she had to click on a single tab at least 10 times for it to respond.
 - The pen which they had provided her for was of sub standard quality and she had to ask for a new pen 4 times.
 - The questions were encrypted and on pressing "Next Question" tab more than one question got skipped sometimes and navigation was difficult due to multiple tabs.

11. That it is also submitted that environment of the examination was not conducive at all and there was shouting and chaos everywhere. Some students were shifted as many as 4 times during the course of paper. It is further submitted that the students were also discussing answers and invigilators were always busy with setting some candidates screen right.
12. That it is respectfully submitted that another student Petitioner No.3 Ms. Kanupriya Tiwardi and Petitioner No. 14 Mr. Harshit Darak whose examination center was also Vivekananda Institute of Technology, Jaipur faced similar issues. Petitioner No.3 had reported that the invigilators instead of helping them out were mocking them and shouting at them which resulted in total chaos in the examination hall because of which some of the students were able to cheat and discuss questions among themselves affecting the sanctity and decorum of examination of such a national level.
13. That it is further submitted that another student Petitioner No. 4 Mr. Rachit Sharma has suffered issues such as the mouse of the computer didn't work properly, the paper was full of technical glitches and went blank for almost 5 minutes and the invigilators didn't add back the time. Even the computer system couldn't handle the new interface which was glitch ridden and my test kept stopping after every 15 minutes.
14. That Petitioner No. 2 Ms. Kriti Agrawal and Petitioner No. 11 Ms. Siddhi Jain who wrote their exams at the Radhakrishnan Institute of Technology, Jaipur also complain that they were not provided the mouse despite asking for it at least 8 to 10 times and there were such questions for which they had

marked correctly but the answer key displays something else due to which She lost a total of 6 to 7 marks unnecessarily.

15. That Petitioner No. 12 Ms. Divya Surana who wrote the exam at the same center had informed that the students were allowed to discuss the questions among themselves as invigilators were not focusing on examination instead were found escaping from their duties.
16. That Petitioner No. 5 Mr. Nikhil Aman and Petitioner No. 13 Ms. Yashi Maheshwari who wrote their examination at Arya Institute of Technology have complained and submit that their computers did not start on time and it only started after 15 minutes and 30 minutes respectively which time was not given to them later on and he missed those 15 and 30 minutes completing the paper only in the rest of time. They were made to change their computers 3 to 4 times.
17. That Petitioner No. 6 Ms. Diksha Chaudhary who wrote her exam at Rajdhani Institute of Technology, Jaipur complains that her computer also did not start on time and she when it was started, it started with a blank screen on it for a few minutes which were never given back to her and she lost them which affected her paper negatively.
18. That Petitioner No.7 Mr. Robin Rathi and Petitioner No. 15 Mr. Abhishek Sharma who wrote the examination at Kindle Institute of Technology complain that the computers hanged and there were other technical problems for example, the question paper first appeared on the machine and then vanished, making loss of as much as 8-10 minutes from their allotted 2 hours.

19. They further narrated that there were no seats allotted to them in a systematic or pre-planned manner. They were told to sit anywhere they could find a vacant seat. The Students verbally fighting with the invigilators and Queries by students ignored. There was no electricity at times and they were made false promises by the invigilators that they would be given extra time but no extra time was allotted to them.
20. That Petitioner No. 8 Mr. Karan Jamalpuria and Petitioner No. 9 Ms. Sakshi Mehta who also wrote the examination at the same center found the situation out of control losing lot of time and concentration due to hue and cry all over the place.
21. That it is further submitted that Petitioner No. 16 Ms. Avisha Agrawal who appeared for the exam at Taxila Business School, Mansarovar had faced similar issues at her center due to which she lost her precious time, concentration and confidence to write the exam.
22. That it is most respectfully brought to the notice of this court that the CLAT 2018 was a complete disaster for the students not just in Jaipur city but also in various other cities as one such petition has also been filed before the Punjab and Haryana High Court addressing the similar grievances and the matter was also brought to the notice of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in another matter relating to CLAT pending before the court. One similar petition is filed by two students before this Hon'ble Court as well.

23. The blog post by 'Lawoctopus', a major website related to the five year law, reported the list of mismanagement issues which were confirmed by several candidates of CLAT 2018 examination. These issues included:
- a. Glitches in the computer systems and freezing of the systems;
 - b. Commotions in the exam centres resulting from misdemeanor of the invigilators;
 - c. Unacknowledged queries of the candidates;
 - d. Poor infrastructure of the exam centres;
 - e. Glitches in the online exam;
 - f. Glitches in the time limit for the examination;
 - g. Malfunctioning of the biometric verification system done before the examination and thus leading to unnecessary delays;
 - h. Improper dissemination of information regarding exam centres;
 - i. Power cuts; and
 - j. Improper seat management in the exam centres;

The above-mentioned issues are non-exhaustive and there are various other issues that display the serious malfunctioning of the organization of CLAT.

True copy of the weblink of Lawctopus.com dated 13.05.2018 as downloaded on 20.05.2018 is annexed herewith and marked as **ANNEXURE-3 (pg to)**.

Being aggrieved by gross and clear cut violation of the online instructions (**Annexure-2**), the petitioners have no other remedy except to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this

Hon'ble Court and is preferring this petition on the following amongst other grounds:

GROUNDS

- A. Because all the above students have been preparing for CLAT for past one or even two years in some case, especially taking an year off after their 12th standard, some of them have shifted to Jaipur city only for the purpose of preparing for CLAT, taking coaching spending huge amount of money, dreaming of entering into top National Law Universities after working hard for such a long time and they are in total shock and disappointment losing faith in the examination and system of competition exams after the above narrated incidents.
- B. That the above incidents narrate the sad state of affairs indicating unfairness and injustice to the students playing with their careers causing tremendous hardship to their lives ahead.
- C. Because such a gross injustice is being caused to them that the conducting university NUALS, Kochi is not paying any attention to these grievances and making false promises every day.
- D. Because of the above incidents the students lost their confidence in the examination, lost their concentration and they had to suffer from wastage of time resulting in bad and unexpected scores which they are not able to accept at any cost.

E. BECAUSE the students pay high amount of Rs 4000/- as registration form and prepare for a long time to be able to give this examination and therefore it is incumbent upon the organizing university to organized the said examination in a free, fair and efficient manner as even a minor glitch can put the career and hard work of various student at stake.

The petitioners crave the leave of this Hon'ble Court to urge the other grounds at the time of arguments.

PRAYER

The petitioners humbly pray that your lordship may graciously be pleased allow this petition and by an appropriate writ, order or direction, Respondents No.1 to 3 may kindly be directed to:

1. Conduct a re-examination for Common Law Admission test 2018 and do so in free, fair and efficient manner.
2. Constitute an enquiry committee to look into the conduct of officials at examination centres namely Vivekananda Institute of Technology, Jaipur, Radhakrishnan Institute of Technology, Jaipur, Arya Institute of Technology, Jaipur, Rajdhani Institute of Technology, Jaipur, Kindle Institute of Techonology, Jaipur and Taxila Business School, Mansarovar, Jaipur.

Any other appropriate writ order or direction, which this Hon'ble Court may deem just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case in favour of the petitioner.

Humble Petitioners

Through their counsel

(Aditya Jain/Ravi Saini)

Advocates

Certified that:

1. This is S.B. Civil Writ Petition as no vires of any Act of Rule is under challenge.
2. No such Writ Petition has been filed prior to it either before this Hon'ble Court or in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India by the Petitioner.
3. PF/Notices and extra copies will be filed as per court's orders.
4. As pie papers are not readily available hence, the same has been typed by my private Steno in my office.

COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER.

Place: Jaipur

Date:

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE JUDICATURE FOR
RAJASTHANAT JAIPUR BENCH,
JAIPUR
S. B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION (M) NO. / 2018**

Aeshita Singh and Ors.

.....Petitioners

Vs

CLAT 2018-Working Committee and Ors.

.....Respondents

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF WRIT PETITION

I, Aeshita Singh D/o Dr. [REDACTED] aged about [REDACTED] years, R/o [REDACTED] do hereby take oath and state as under:-

1. That I am the Petitioner No.1 in the present case hence, I am well conversant with the facts and circumstances of the present case.
2. That, the annexed Writ Petition has been drafted by my counsel under my instructions. I have gone through it and have understood the same.
3. That the contents of Writ Petition are true and correct as per my personal knowledge and the legal submissions made therein are believed to be true and correct on the basis of legal advice given to me by my counsel.

DEPONENT

VERIFICATION

I, the above named deponent, do hereby take oath and verify that the contents of para no. 1 to 3 of my above affidavit are true and correct to my personal knowledge. Nothing material has been concealed and no part of it is wrong. SO HELP ME GOD.

DEPONENT

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE JUDICATURE FOR
RAJASTHANAT JAIPUR BENCH,
JAIPUR**

S. B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION (M) NO. / 2018

Aeshita Singh and Ors.

.....Petitioners

Vs

CLAT 2018, Working Committee and Ors.

.....Respondent

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF DOCUMENTS

I, Aeshita Singh D/o [REDACTED] aged about [REDACTED]s, R/o [REDACTED] do hereby take oath and state as under:-

1. That I am the Petitioner No. 1 in the present case hence, I am well conversant with the facts and circumstances of the present case.
2. That annexure 1 to 3 annexed with the writ petition are the true and correct of their originals.

DEPONENT

VERIFICATION

I, the above named deponent, do hereby take oath and verify that the contents of para no. 1 to 2 of my above affidavit are true and correct to my personal knowledge. Nothing material has been concealed and no part of it is wrong. SO HELP ME GOD.

DEPONENT

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE JUDICATURE FOR
RAJASTHANAT JAIPUR BENCH,
JAIPUR**

S.B. CIVIL MISC. STAY APPLICATION NO...../2018

IN

S. B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION (M) NO. /2018

1. Aeshita Singh D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
2. Kriti Agarwal D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED]s, R/o [REDACTED],
[REDACTED]n
3. Kanu Priya Tiwari D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED]s, R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Colony, Dharwar, Rajasthan
4. Rachit Sharma, S/o [REDACTED] Age [REDACTED]s, R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
5. Nikhil Aman, S/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
6. Diksha Chaudhary D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED], R/o
[REDACTED]
7. Robin Rathi, S/o [REDACTED] Rathi, Age-[REDACTED]s, R/o [REDACTED],
[REDACTED]
8. Kamal Jamal Puriya, S/o [REDACTED], Age [REDACTED]s, R/o
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
9. Sakshi Mehta, D/o [REDACTED], Age-[REDACTED]s, R/o [REDACTED],
[REDACTED] Jeevan Sakshi, Sisarma Road, Udaipur, Rajasthan

10. Akash Meena, S/o [REDACTED], Age [REDACTED], R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
11. Siddhi Jain, D/o [REDACTED], Age [REDACTED]s, R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
12. Divya Surana, D/o [REDACTED], Age [REDACTED] years, R/o 7, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED].
13. Yashoda Mandowara D/o [REDACTED] Age- [REDACTED] R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
14. Harshit Darak S/o [REDACTED], Age- [REDACTED]s, R/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
15. Abhishek Sharma, S/o [REDACTED] Shankar Sharma, Age [REDACTED]s, R/o [REDACTED],
[REDACTED]
16. Avisha Agarwal D/o [REDACTED] Age [REDACTED] years, R/o 31/6,
[REDACTED]

.....Petitioners

Vs

1. CLAT 2018- Working Committee

Through its Convenor, Prof. (Dr.) Rose Varghese
National University of Advanced Legal Studies (NUALS),
Medical College - NAD Rd, HMT Colony, North Kalamassery,
Kalamassery, Kochi, Kerala 683503 ...Respondent No. 1

2. CLAT 2018 - Implementation Committee

Through its Chairman, Prof. (Dr.) Rose Varghese
National University of Advanced Legal Studies (NUALS),
Medical College - NAD Rd, HMT Colony, North Kalamassery,
Kalamassery, Kochi, Kerala 683503

...Respondent No. 2

3. The National University of Advanced Legal Studies

Through its Vice Chancellor, Medical College - NAD Rd, HMT
Colony, North Kalamassery, Kalamassery, Kochi, Kerala 683503

...Respondent No. 3

.....Respondents

**STAY APPLICATION UNDER ARTICLE 226 &
227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR
GRANTING INTERIM RELIEF**

To,

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND HIS
OTHER COMPANION JUDGES OF HON'BLE
HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR
RAJASTHAN, JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR.**

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR LORDSHIPS:

The humble petitioners most respectfully beg to submit
as under:-

1. That the petitioners have filed this writ petition today in which they have every hope of success.
2. That the contents and grounds mentioned in the writ petition may also be taken as contents and grounds of the present stay application.
3. That if the interim stay is not granted in favour of the petitioners, they will be put a great hardship.
4. That the balance of convenience is also in favour petitioners and they are also likely to suffer irreparable loss.

PRAYER

It is therefore, respectfully prayed that your lordships may graciously be pleased to allow this application and during pendancy writ petition, Respondent No.1 to 3 may be directed not to release the result of CLAT 2018 Examination, which is likely to come out 31st May, 2018.

Any other appropriate order or direction which this Hon'ble Court May deem just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case in favour of the petitioner.

Humble Appellants - Petitioners

Through their counsel

(Aditya Jain/Ravi Saini)
Advocates

Notes:

1. That no such application has been filed by the petitioner prior to it before this Hon'ble Court or in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India by the petitioners.
2. PF/Notices and extra copies shall be filed within the prescribed time limit.
3. As pie papers are not readily available hence, stout papers are used.
4. That it has been typed by my private Steno in my office.

COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONERS

Place:

Dated:

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE JUDICATURE FOR
RAJASTHANAT JAIPUR BENCH,
JAIPUR**

S.B. CIVIL MISC. STAY APPLICATION NO...../2018

IN

S. B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION (M) NO. / 2018

Aeshita Singh and Ors

.....**Petitioners**

CLAT-2018, Working Committee and Ors.

.....**Respondents**

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION

I, Aeshita Singh D/o [REDACTED] aged about [REDACTED]
years, R/o [REDACTED] do
hereby takes oath and state as under:-

1. That I am the Petitioner No. 1 in the present case hence, I am well conversant with the facts and circumstances of the present case.
2. That, the annexed application for interim relief has been drafted by my counsel under my instructions. I have gone through it and have understood the same.
3. That the contents of application is true and correct as per my personal knowledge and the legal submissions made therein are believed to be true and correct on the basis of legal advice given to me by my counsel.

DEPONENT

VERIFICATION

I, the above named deponent, do hereby take oath and verify that the contents of para no. 1 to 3 of my above affidavit are true and correct to my personal knowledge. Nothing material has been concealed and no part of it is wrong. SO HELP ME GOD.

DEPONENT

Place: Jaipur,

Dated:

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE JUDICATURE FOR
RAJASTHANAT JAIPUR BENCH,
JAIPUR
S. B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION (M) NO. / 2018**

Aeshita Singh and Ors.

.....Petitioners

Vs

CLAT 2018-Working Committee and Ors.

.....Respondent

INDEX

S.No.	Particulars	Page no.
1.	Writ Petition	
2.	Affidavit in support of Writ Petition	
3.	Stay application	
4.	Affidavit in support of application	
5.	Documents:- Annexure-1 True Copy of Admit Cards of Petitioner No 1 to 16 Annexure-2 Copy of online test instruction issued by Respondents Annexure-3 True copy of the weblink of Lawctopus.com dated 13.05.2018	
6.	Affidavit in Support of documents	

COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER

(Aditya Jain/Ravi Saini)

ADVOCATES

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE JUDICATURE FOR
RAJASTHANAT JAIPUR BENCH,
JAIPUR**

S. B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION (M) NO. / 2018

Aeshita Singh and Ors.

.....**Petitioners**

Vs

CLAT 2018-Working Committee and Ors.

.....**Respondents**

BRIEF SYNOPSIS AND DATE OF EVENTS

Petitioners no. 1 to 16 prepared for CLAT 2018 for one whole year and thereafter submitted their application form, after which they were given their admit card. (Annexure-1) That it is pertinent to mention here that on the admit card of students, online test instructions are specifically mentioned. One of instructions is as under: (Annexure-2)

"17-In the event of the examination being disrupted for technical reasons, the candidate should immediately inform the invigilator. The timer would automatically stop and the invigilator will help the candidate to re-login the examination. This will start the examination timer from where it had stopped."

CLAT 2018, was conducted across various cities on 13.05.2018 in the most mismanaged, unorganized and inefficient manner, due to the present petitioners have suffered irreparable loss affecting their career

and future prospects severely. Further, the exam was conducted online with a lot of technical errors resulting in loss of precious time of applicant petitioners which has hampered their scores in the examination. Petitioner No. 1, Ms. Aeshita Singh appeared for the exam at Vivekanand Institute of Technology, Jaipur on the said day after preparing for one whole year fully for the exam hoping to do her best but she witnesses the following irregularities during the said exam because of which she was not able to attempt the paper in a smooth manner:

- Once the exam started she lost around 11 minutes due to questions not appearing on screen, when she brought this to invigilator's attention, he himself was so clueless and untrained and he told her that she won't get extra time, due to which many candidates including got shocked.
- Throughout the paper, the screen kept freezing and mouse didn't work properly and she had to click on a single tab at least 10 times for it to respond.
- The pen which they had provided her for was of sub standard quality and she had to ask for a new pen 4 times.
- The questions were encrypted and on pressing "Next Question" tab more than one question got skipped sometimes and navigation was difficult due to multiple tabs.

It is also submitted that environment of the examination was not conducive at all and there was shouting and chaos everywhere. Some students were shifted as many as 4 times

during the course of paper. It is further submitted that the students were also discussing answers and invigilators were always busy with setting some candidates screen right.

Petitioner No.3 Ms. Kanupriya Tiwardi and Petitioner No. 14 Mr. Harshit Darak whose examination center was also Vivekananda Institute of Technology, Jaipur faced similar issues. Petitioner No.3 had reported that the invigilators instead of helping them out were mocking them and shouting at them which resulted in total chaos in the examination hall because of which some of the students were able to cheat and discuss questions among themselves affecting the sanctity and decorum of examination of such a national level.

Petitioner No. 4 Mr. Rachit Sharma has suffered issues such as the mouse of the computer didn't work properly, the paper was full of technical glitches and went blank for almost 5 minutes and the invigilators didn't add back the time. Even the computer system couldn't handle the new interface which was glitch ridden and my test kept stopping after every 15 minutes.

Petitioner No. 2 Ms. Kriti Agrawal and Petitioner No. 11 Ms. Siddhi Jain who wrote their exams at the Radhakrishnan Institute of Technology, Jaipur also complain that they were not provided the mouse despite asking for it at least 8 to 10 times and there were such questions for which they had marked correctly but the answer key displays something else due to which She lost a total of 6 to 7 marks unnecessarily.

Petitioner No. 12 Ms. Divya Surana who wrote the exam at the same center had informed that the students were allowed to discuss the questions among themselves as invigilators were not focusing on examination instead were found escaping from their duties. Petitioner No. 5 Mr. Nikhil Aman and Petitioner No. 13 Ms. Yashi Maheshwari who wrote their examination at Arya Institute of Technology have complained and submit that their computers did not start on time and it only started after 15 minutes and 30 minutes respectively which time was not given to them later on and he missed those 15 and 30 minutes completing the paper only in the rest of time. They were made to change their computers 3 to 4 times.

Petitioner No. 6 Ms. Diksha Chaudhary who wrote her exam at Rajdhani Institute of Technology, Jaipur complains that her computer also did not start on time and she when it was started, it started with a blank screen on it for a few minutes which were never given back to her and she lost them which affected her paper negatively.

Petitioner No.7 Mr. Robin Rathi and Petitioner No. 15 Mr. Abhishek Sharma who wrote the examination at Kindle Institute of Technology complain that the computers hanged and there were other technical problems for example, the question paper first appeared on the machine and then vanished, making loss of as much as 8-10 minutes from their allotted 2 hours.

They further narrated that there were no seats allotted to them in a systematic or pre-planned manner. They were told to sit anywhere they could find a vacant seat.

The Students verbally fighting with the invigilators and Queries by students ignored. There was no electricity at times and they were made false promises by the invigilators that they would be given extra time but no extra time was allotted to them. That Petitioner No. 8 Mr. Karan Jamalpuria and Petitioner No. 9 Ms. Sakshi Mehta who also wrote the examination at the same center found the situation out of control losing lot of time and concentration due to hue and cry all over the place.

Petitioner No. 16 Ms. Avisha Agrawal who appeared for the exam at Taxila Business School, Mansarovar had faced similar issues at her center due to which she lost her precious time, concentration and confidence to write the exam.

That it is most respectfully brought to the notice of this court that the CLAT 2018 was a complete disaster for the students not just in Jaipur city but also in various other cities as one such petition has also been filed before the Punjab and Haryana High Court addressing the similar grievances and the matter was also brought to the notice of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in another matter relating to CLAT pending before the court. One similar petition is filed by two students before this Hon'ble Court as well.

Aggrieved by the failure of duty cast upon Respondent No. 1 to 3 to conduct the examination in a free, fair and efficient manner which has resulted in violation of fundamental rights of Petitioner under Article 14, 19 and 21 of Constitution, the present writ petition is being filed by them.

COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONERS

(Aditya Jain/Ravi Saini)

