



2025:DHC:8404



\$~J-1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% *Judgment Delivered on: 22.09.2025*

+ W.P.(C) 5690/2025 & CM APPL. 25989/2025

SHASHANK SHEKHAR PANDEYPetitioner

Through: Mr. Shivam Pandey, Mr. Priyanshu Upadhyay, Mr. Abhinav Sharma and Mr. Gangesh Kumar Jha, Advs.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Khanna, SC for NTA with Ms. Pragya Bhushan, Mr. Tarandeep Singh, Ms. Vilakshana Dayma, Ms. Pankhuri Srivastava and Ms. Alekshendra Sharma, Advs. for NTA. Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy, Ms. Usha Jammal, Ms. Harshita Chaturvedi, Advs. with Experts Mr. S. Shree Vishnoo and Mr. Subodh S. for NCFL. Mr. Neeraj, SPC with Mr. Vedansh Anand, GP with Mr. Soumyadip Chakraborty, Adv. for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN**JUDGMENT****VIKAS MAHAJAN, J**

1. The present petition has been filed seeking following reliefs:

“(a) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, including a writ of mandamus, directing the Respondent to rectify the



discrepancies in the Petitioner's Recorded Response Sheet for the Joint Entrance Examination (JEE Main) – 2025, Session 2, and to duly consider all the 46 questions attempted by the Petitioner, in respect of the Petitioner's Application Number: 250310868069;

b) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, directing the Respondent to recompute the Petitioner's NTA Score on the basis of the corrected Recorded Response Sheet and to declare a revised result accordingly, in respect of the Petitioner's Application Number: 250310868069;

c) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, directing the Respondent to review and rectify the errors pointed out in the final Answer Key and to take appropriate consequential steps in accordance with law;

d) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, directing the Respondent to permit the Petitioner to register and participate in the JEE (Advanced) –2025 examination provisionally, pending the final outcome of the present writ petition;

e) Issue an appropriate writ, order, or direction, thereby directing the Respondents to extend the deadline for registration to the Joint Entrance Examination (Advanced), 2025, in respect of the Petitioner, till the disposal of the writ petition;

f) Issue an appropriate writ, order, or direction, thereby mandating the Respondent to put in place an effective and transparent grievance redressal mechanism for addressing discrepancies in Recorded Response Sheets and related grievances of candidates, in a time-bound manner;

g) Issue an appropriate writ, order, or direction, thereby constituting an independent committee comprising senior officials, academicians, and technical experts to enquire into the discrepancies and systemic lapses in the conduct of the JEE (Main) – 2025 examination process, and to submit a report within a time-bound period as deemed appropriate by this Hon'ble Court”

2. The case set out in the present petition is that petitioner herein



2025:DHC:8404



appeared for Session II of JEE (Main) – 2025 held on 04.04.2025 which is a Computer Based Test [hereafter 'CBT']. According to the petitioner, upon submitting his answer sheet after completion of his examination, a pop-up message was shown depicting that he had attempted 46 questions while 29 were shown as un-attempted. Thereafter, respondent no.2/NTA published a provisional answer key along with the recorded response sheets of the candidates on 11.04.2025. Upon downloading his response sheet, petitioner discovered that the value of number of questions attempted and un-attempted were inverted inasmuch as 29 questions were shown as attempted while 46 were shown as un-attempted.

3. Further, the grievance of the petitioner is that NTA had invited objections from 11.04.2025 to 13.04.2025, but restricted only to challenge against the answer key, and no option to dispute errors in their recorded response sheets was given to the candidates.

4. The present case was first listed before this Court on 01.05.2025. Learned standing counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.2/NTA, on the said date, had refuted the claims of the petitioner, contending that JEE (Main) – 2025 is an examination conducted in CBT format. It was argued that in such a format, each and every action on the computer by the candidate is recorded in the form of log entries which can be verified. Placing reliance on the same, it was stated by the NTA that as per their official records, petitioner had attempted only 29 questions and not 46.

5. Subsequently, at joint request of the parties and considering the technical aspect involved in the present case, as well as, the fact that in another matter [W.P.(C) No.5904/2025] a similar grievance was raised by



petitioners therein, this Court deemed it fit to refer both the cases for forensic analysis and obtain opinion of technical experts, i.e. Central Forensic Science Laboratory (CFSL), CBI. To put at rest the controversy involved in the present case, this Court *vide* order dated 14.05.2025, with the consent of learned counsel for the parties, sent the matter for forensic analysis with the following queries:

“i. Whether the analysis of the logs show the number of questions attempted and un-attempted by the candidate as indicated in the pop-up displayed at the end of the examination? If so, what are they? Were the values with regard to the questions attempted and un-attempted by the petitioner ever changed?”

ii. Whether any system errors occurred and/or editing/tampering was done in the software or at the level of backend system administrator or at the examination centre during the conduct of examination or after submission of the Computer Based Test by the candidate or at any other time, in respect of the response sheets of the petitioner?”

6. However, Director, CFSL issued a letter dated 19.05.2025 addressed to the Registrar General of this Court, expressing the inability of CFSL to conduct the enquiry as it lacks the necessary infrastructure and expertise in network forensics and server imaging of NTA/NIC servers. Regardless, Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of CFSL, on instructions submitted that National Cyber Forensic Laboratory (NCFL), Dwarka, New Delhi has the requisite expertise to conduct the forensic analysis and thus, proposed that the matter may be referred to them. Accordingly, with the consent of the parties, NCFL was requested to undertake the exercise *vide* order dated 20.05.2025.



7. NCFL submitted its report dated 28.05.2025 before this Court and the same was taken on record *vide* order dated 29.05.2025. A copy of the said report was also furnished to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

8. Mr. Shivam Pandey, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the core grievance of the petitioner is with regard to the complete and unexplained absence of the log entry for the mandatory 'Assessment Summary' pop-up screen. He submits that the petitioner has consistently maintained that this summary screen showed 46 questions as attempted and 29 un-attempted.

9. Elaborating on his submission, he submits that the official TCS Candidate Data Security – Write-Up, which was placed before NCFL, reveals glaring discrepancies in the audit logs provided by respondent no.2/NTA. He invites attention of the Court to page 4 of the TCS Write-Up which outlines a mandatory 'Typical Candidate Journey' during the assessment. Emphasising on points 8, 9 and 10 of the said 'journey', he submits that after submission of exam, a detailed Assessment Summary page ought to be shown to the candidate. The said page would display the total number of questions answered, not answered, and marked for review.

10. Further, he points out that at page 7 of the said Write-Up, para 6 therein indicates that upon the candidate clicking the Submit button, the summary page shall appear which will have the details of the questions.

11. He submits that the feedback stage and conclusion of the examination is done only after the candidate visits this compulsory Assessment Summary page. He therefore contends that the said summary page is not a discretionary or backend feature, but a compulsory one.



12. Placing reliance on para 3(1)(c) of the NCFL Report, wherein it has been observed by the technical experts that *'it cannot be opined that whether pop up was displayed on the screen at the end of the examination as no logs related to this activity are available in the audit log session 2 given by the NTA'*, Mr. Pandey submits that contention of the petitioner is supported by the report of NCFL.

13. He contends that the inconsistency in the audit logs become even more apparent in view of the fact that the logs filed along with the counter affidavit itself show that the petitioner submitted the examination at 12:00:11.138 and then submitted feedback form at 12:01:06.520. He submits that as per the technology partner of respondent no.2/NTA, i.e. TCS, the mandatory Assessment Summary screen must fall between these two entries.

14. *Per contra*, Mr. Sanjay Khanna, learned standing counsel for the respondent no.2/NTA, invites attention of the Court to the Information Bulletin for JEE (Main) – 2025 examination, specifically to Appendix IX titled 'Computer Based Test (CBT)'. He refers to para 19 therein to contend that the examination has a built-in auto-submit feature, a process that is not controlled by the candidate.

15. Elaborating further, he submits that during the examination, there is an on-screen computer clock which is set at the server. Upon the countdown timer reaching zero, the examination will end by itself. He submits that the instructions explicitly state that the candidates will not be required to end or submit the examination after completion of three hours and the exam's conclusion is an automated, server-controlled event.

16. Mr. Khanna submits that in petitioner's case, this exact process of



automatic submission has occurred which explains the absence of a log entry for the alleged Summary page, referred to by the petitioner. He submits that the log entries are activity logs that capture actions initiated by the candidate, such as a mouse click or cursor movement. Since conclusion of the exam is a pre-programmed automatic event that requires no action by the candidate, no corresponding ‘action’ is performed by the petitioner. Therefore, the system does not generate an audit log for this automatic event.

17. Controverting the contention of the petitioner with regard to the ‘Assessment Summary’ chart shown in the TCS Write-Up, he submits that the same is not relevant to the present matter as the format mentioned therein does not relate to JEE (Main) examination. He submits that the chart in question distinctly shows separate sections for ‘Group I’ and ‘Group II’ which are statedly not a feature of the JEE (Main) examination structure. The said portion of the Write-Up is reproduced hereunder:

“Assessment Summary

Group 2 (Current Group)

<i>Section Name</i>	<i>No. Of Questions</i>	<i>Answered</i>	<i>Not Answered</i>	<i>Marked for Review</i>	<i>Answered & Marked for Review (will also be evaluated)</i>	<i>Not Visited</i>
<i>Display and tearing of rough sheets</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

Group 1 (Attempted Group, View not allowed Edit not allowed)

<i>Section Name</i>	<i>No. Of Questions</i>	<i>Answered</i>	<i>Not Answered</i>	<i>Marked for Review</i>	<i>Answered & Marked for Review (will also be evaluated)</i>	<i>Not Visited</i>
<i>Test of Regulatory knowledge and working of the</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>54</i>



2025:DHC:8404



Bank						
Test of Knowledge Current Events, Geopolitics Macro Economics	30	0	1	0	0	29

Are you sure to submit this Group Click Yes to proceed Click No to go back
Dear Candidate. Once the Group is submitted you cannot revisit and edit your responses
Yes No”

18. Mr. Khanna further invites attention of the Court to the audit logs filed along with counter affidavit of NTA. Referring to the last few entries at page 85, he submits that there is a distinct log entry recording the candidate’s cursor activity for manual submission of the feedback form at 12:01:06:520 which tags the activity as ‘Candidate Submitted The Feedback’. However, no such entry is present relatable to the submission of examination, indicating no activity by the petitioner at the said time.

19. He places reliance on the decision of a Coordinate Bench of this Court in *Aishani Ojha v. National Testing Agency and Anr., 2022 SCC OnLine Del 2604*, wherein after scrutinizing the official records, this Court found no reason to believe a petitioner’s mere ‘speculations’ of error. He submits that the petitioner's version is contradicted by the verified electronic audit logs, which record candidate’s every action in real-time. In the absence of any manifest technical error, the official record maintained by the NTA takes precedence.

20. Further, replying upon the decisions in *Gaurav Jaiswal v. Union of India & Ors., 2021 SCC OnLine Del 3456* and *Tanishq Mishra v. NTA & Ors., 2022 SCC OnLine Del 2482*, Mr. Khanna submits that the petitioner, at best, has raised disputed questions of fact which cannot be adjudicated in writ proceedings.



21. In rejoinder, Mr. Pandey has placed reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *State of U.P. and Anr. v. Ehsan and Anr., 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1331*.

22. He further submits that he was constrained to file the present petition since respondent/NTA provides no internal redressal mechanism for a candidate to challenge their official recorded response sheet.

23. At this stage, Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy, learned counsel for National Forensic Science Laboratory (NFSL) submits that the TCS Write-Up referred to by the parties, was given by respondent no.2/NTA only to enable NCFL to understand the terminology and content of the audit logs for data analysis.

24. I have carefully examined the material on record, as well as, the rival contentions of the parties.

25. The grievance of the petitioner is primarily based on the submission that at the conclusion of his examination in Session II of JEE (Main) – 2025, a 'pop-up' summary page reflected that he had attempted 46 questions and 29 questions were left un-attempted. On the other hand, respondent no.2/NTA, which is the examination conducting body, has refuted the claim of the petitioner, taking a categorical stand that the official records maintained by them demonstrate that petitioner had attempted only 29 questions, whereas 46 questions remained un-attempted.

26. Having regard to the technical aspect involved in the present dispute and the vehement assertion of the petitioner that there is a discrepancy in the petitioner's recorded response sheet for the JEE (Main) – 2025 for Session II as compared to his actual attempt, as well as, the joint request of parties to



undertake such an exercise, this Court deemed it fit to obtain opinion of technical experts after due forensic analysis. Thus, *vide* order dated 14.05.2025, this Court referred the matter to CFSL with due consent of the parties.

27. However, in view of the letter dated 19.05.2025 from the Director, CFSL stating the inability of CFSL undertake the exercise, *vide* order dated 20.05.2025, this Court referred the matter to NCFL. Subsequently, Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy, appearing on behalf of NCFL, furnished the forensic report of NCFL dated 28.05.2025, which was taken on record.

28. The report of NCFL dated 28.05.2025 has been perused by this Court. In the said report, basis the examination of the material provided to NCFL by respondent no.2/NTA, the following observations have been made with regard to the number of questions attempted and un-attempted by the petitioner:

- “(1) The provided audit logs by NTA in the folder named as “Audit Log session 2” (as mention in Figure 2) were thoroughly analysed. For nomenclature of the heading in activity column provided in the logs were asked from NTA. As per the details provided by them through the email marked as (Ref. Document-1). For the same are as follows,*
- a) **The number of questions attempted - 29** (related logs has been provided in hard copy marked as “Annexure-1 Questions Attempted” page number (Page no.5)).*
 - b) **The number of questions un-attempted – 46** (related logs has been provided in hard copy marked as “Annexure-2 Questions Un-attempted” page number (Page No. 6)).*
 - c) **It cannot be opined that whether pop up was displayed on the screen at the end of the examination as***



no logs related to this activity are available in the audit log session 2 given by the NTA.

(2) *As per the logs provided by NTA it can't be opined whether editing/tampering or system errors occurred in the software or at the level of backend administrator or at the examination centre during the conduct of examination or after submission of the computer-based test by the candidate."*

(emphasis supplied)

29. After conducting analysis of the relevant records, the technical experts have given a finding that the petitioner had attempted only 29 questions and not 46 as claimed by the petitioner. However, as noted above, the bone of contention is with regard to the alleged pop-up message or the 'Assessment Summary' page which appears at the conclusion of the exam, and whether the same had appeared for the petitioner as well, showing his attempted questions as 46.

30. Though, the petitioner has argued that said pop-up message was shown at the end of his attempt in Session II of the JEE (Main) – 2025, but the audit logs for the same are absent as per the official records of respondent no.2/NTA which points to a system anomaly. Such absence of log data has also been noted by the technical experts in their report dated 28.05.2025.

31. In this regard, respondent no.2/NTA has placed reliance on the Information Bulletin for JEE (Main) – 2025 published by them, particularly on Appendix IX of the Bulletin which sets out the relevant information for candidates taking examination in Computer Based Test (CBT) format. The general instructions contained therein dictate *inter alia* the procedure for



answering a question which suggests that after marking any answer, the candidate would be required to save the same and go to the next question after clicking a button tagged as 'Save and Next'. The said portion of Appendix IX is as under:

- “9. Procedure for answering a Multiple-Choice Type question:*
- a. To select your answer, click on the button of one of the options.*
 - b. To deselect your chosen answer, click on the button of the chosen option again or click on the Clear Response button.*
 - c. The answer can be changed, if required, anytime during the test. To save the answer, the candidate MUST click on the “Save and Next” button.*
 - d. To save your answer, you must click on the Save & Next button*
 - e. To mark the question for review (without answering it), click on the ‘Mark for Review & Next’ button.”*

32. With regard to submission of the examination, another clause has been given under the heading of 'Instruction for Question', relevant being para 19 therein, which provides that upon conclusion of the allotted time, indicated by a timer on-screen, a feature kicks in whereby the examination ends by itself and the candidates are not required to manually end or submit the examination. Relevant para reads thus:

*“19. The on-screen computer clock counter of every candidate will be set at the server. The countdown timer on the top right side of the computer screen will display the time remaining (in minutes) available for the candidate to complete the examination. **When the timer reaches zero, the examination will end by itself. The candidates will not be required to end or submit the examination.**”*

(emphasis supplied)



33. Having referred to the above information, it appears that the CBT format, in which examination for JEE (Main) – 2025 had been conducted, provided for a contingency to auto-submit the response of the candidates in case the candidate is not left with any time to submit the examination before it concludes. This, to my mind, appears to be a safety function for the benefit of the candidates, in case they lose track of time during their attempt at the exam, which is a common occurrence during high pressure situations.

34. Be that as it may, the function as described above, being automatic in nature, would definitely not require the candidate to do any action, with the mouse or otherwise. Notably, enquiry conducted by NCFL was based on the audit logs, which are computer generated records of all actions done by the candidates. Therefore, logically understood, when there is no action by a candidate, the same would not be recorded in the audit logs either.

35. Having regard to the above observations, this Court finds substance in the contention of Mr. Khanna, that absence of audit logs with regard to the alleged ‘pop-up’ summary page after conclusion of petitioner’s examination, cannot be assumed as a system anomaly. There is every possibility that the exam was submitted automatically. The explanation offered by the respondent no.2/NTA appears to be both cogent and consistent with the instructions contained in the Information Bulletin for JEE (Main) – 2025.

36. Further, the audit logs themselves show a distinct log entry for the petitioner’s manual action of submitting the feedback form, denoted as ‘Candidate Submitted The Feedback’, which indicates that voluntary actions by a candidate are duly recorded with appropriate tags.

37. On the contrary, perusal of the logs just prior to the final audit log,



2025:DHC:8404



especially the log pertaining to submission of the exam, demonstrates that the same has been done at 12:00:11:138 with the tag ‘Submitted the exam’. To be noted, the said tag does not indicate that the action was done by the candidate. Pertinently, the start of the examination was recorded at 09:00:10:762 with the tag ‘Clicked :: I am ready to begin and Time Left :180:00’. Considering that the two logs are within the exact time span of the examination, i.e. 3 hours, it can safely be concluded that the exam was auto submitted, and not by the petitioner himself as a manual action.

38. Reliance by the petitioner on the ‘Assessment Summary’ page also does not inspire confidence since the same does not find mention in the Information Bulletin. Rather, the same has been mentioned in a document published by TCS, which appears to have been sent to NCFL merely for reference to enable NCFL to understand technicalities of the system. Admittedly, diagram of such the page as shown in the TCS Write-Up, suggests that it relates to certain ‘Groups’ which does not form part of the examination format in JEE (Main) and may be part of a different examination, considering that NTA is entrusted with conducting various national level examinations.

39. Having regard to the above discussion, it seems that petitioner’s entire case is predicated on his personal recollection of a transient ‘pop-up’ message appearing after submission of his exam. On the other hand, NTA’s stand is that in view of the auto submit that occurred for the petitioner, no summary ‘pop-up’ message would have been shown and the petitioner would have directly been taken to the feedback page. The assertion of petitioner being in dispute, and nothing having been brought on record to



substantiate his claim, no *prima facie* case can be said to have been made out in petitioner's favour.

40. Thus, in the absence of any manifest technical error, which has been ruled out as above, the official record maintained and secured by the NTA, must take precedence over the petitioner's claim. Reference in this regard may be had to the decision in *Aishani Ojha* (supra) wherein, while confronted with similar circumstances, this Court held as under:

“11. The NTA is endowed with conducting various entry-level examinations at the national level. It has established a mechanism and undertaken measures to endeavour a test environment that is free from data infringement or manipulation. For this reason, the JEE (Main) is conducted on a computer system wherein every movement of a candidates' cursor on the screen and their responses are recorded and stored in an electronic database in the form of audit logs, that have been duly produced before the Court. The record/documents relied on by the parties, particularly the response sheet and the audit log for session 2 of JEE (Main) of Petitioner have been scrutinized. As per the audit log, Petitioner cleared responses to several questions after having already attempted/selected a response thereto. While Petitioner has persistently contended that the same are recorded erroneously, the Court finds no reason to believe such speculations. The audit log maintained by the NTA records not only the selected response, but also the number of times a candidate has visited the question, response so selected/entered on a real-time basis. Petitioner has also failed to demonstrate that she had indeed attempted 75 questions. Her version is contradicted by the verified electronic record of NTA, which is maintained by National Informatics Centre. No technical error is manifest and thus, the Court remains unconvinced of Petitioner's claim that a technical snag in the system has resulted in low score in JEE (Main).”

(emphasis supplied)



41. It is also well settled that under Section 114¹ of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, there is a presumption in favour of official records such as the records maintained by NTA, being an autonomous body under the Ministry of Education. In *Selishia Mohandas v. Union of India, Through its Director and Others, 2023 SCC OnLine Del 4973*, this Court observed the said position of law and held as under:

“18. The specific submissions have been made by respondent no.2-NTA in its counter affidavit and the original OMR sheet has also been presented. The record produced by the respondents is the official record. There is no reason to doubt the genuineness of the same.

19. There is a presumption in favour of the official record in terms of Section 114 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872. In absence of any concrete document to rebut the presumption, the correctness of the official record cannot be doubted.

20. There is no reason to believe that respondent no.2-NTA would fabricate or replace the marks obtained by any of the candidates. Respondent no.2-NTA has no personal stake.”

(emphasis supplied)

42. Regardless, it is settled position of law that courts exercising writ jurisdiction under Article 226 ought not enter into a dense factual thicket, especially when a petitioner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case. Reference in this regard may be had to the decision this Court in *Vibhuti Negi* (supra). The relevant part reads as under:

“35. No prima facie case, therefore, can even be said to have been made out by the petitioner, as could persuade this court to accept her submission that the first score card and the first response sheet should be accepted, and the second score card and second response sheet declared illegal.

¹Equivalent to section 119 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhinyam, 2023.



“36. Any further enquiry into the controversy would require the court to enter into a dense factual thicket, which cannot be undertaken under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Suffice it, therefore, to state that, in exercise of Article 226 jurisdiction, this Court is, in the facts before it, unable to accept the petitioner’s assertion that two response sheets and two score cards had been issued by the NTA.”

(emphasis supplied)

43. Likewise, reference may advantageously be had to the judgment in ***Tanishq Mishra*** (supra) in which this Court made following pertinent observations:

“20. The upshot of the above discussion is that the Petitioner does not have the response sheets to authenticate his scores, which could perhaps have supported his version. On the other hand, digital records produced by NTA, system-generated emails, QR mismatch, response sheets with audit log, login details for accessing website, as maintained and authenticated by NIC, all point the case to the contrary. While Petitioner may continue to assert that his documents are authentic, however, on the basis of facts and documents shown, this Court cannot come to this conclusion. The question of forgery and tampering of records can only be determined after the parties have been afforded an opportunity to lead evidence, and this exercise cannot be undertaken in the present proceedings. The Petitioner has failed to prove his bona fides. The Court remains unconvinced of the genuineness of the Petitioner's documents. Thus, there is no basis to grant relief to the Petitioner.”

(emphasis supplied)

44. Lastly, the decision of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***State of U.P. v. Ehsan*** (supra), sought to be relied upon by the petitioner, does not come to his aid since in the said judgment as well, it was held that for compelling reasons, the Court may reject the plea to maintain a writ petition where a serious dispute between the parties on a question of fact has arisen and



2025:DHC:8404



material/evidence(s) available on record are insufficient/inconclusive to enable the Court to come to a definite conclusion.

45. It has already been observed above that nothing is on record to show that the alleged 'pop-up' message relied upon by the petitioner had appeared on his screen. The records produced by respondent no.2/NTA to substantiate their stand is consistent with the findings of technical experts when seen in the light of Information Bulletin. Therefore, there is no compelling reason to entertain the present case any further in writ proceedings.

46. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed. Pending application is disposed of as well.

SEPTEMBER 22, 2025/dss

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J