



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT  
JODHPUR**

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1437/2016

Bharat Nath Yogi S/o Shri Gokul Nath, R/o 11 Math, Residency Road, Bhopalpura, Tehsil Girwa, District – Udaipur (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Rajasthan through Chief Secretary, Govt. of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Principal Secretary, Department of Personnel, Govt. of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Principal Secretary, Department of Law and Legal Affairs, Govt. of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer through Secretary.

----Respondents

---

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Dashrath Singh Rathore  
For Respondent(s) : Mr. Rajesh Punia

---

**JUSTICE DINESH MEHTA**

**Order**

**28/08/2023**

1. By way of the present writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the result declared, more particularly the process of normalisation done by the respondent - Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer (hereinafter referred to as "the R.P.S.C. or the Commission"), in relation to the recruitment notification dated 15.05.2015, issued for the Post of Assistant Public Prosecutor (A.P.P.).

2. Mr. Rajesh Punia, learned counsel appearing for the respondent R.P.S.C. submitted that the examinations of all the centres were held on 18.10.2015, but due to technical error and failure of servers, the examinations of the candidates who



appeared at six centres were deferred to be held on 25.10.2015. Hence, in order to bring parity between two different papers given in the same recruitment, the Commission adopted a process of normalisation by using Equipercntile Equating method (Statistical Equivalence Percentile method) on the basis of the report of the experts and the process which were being adopted by the TOEFL and GRE.

3. In view of the aforesaid explanation of the respondents, normalisation cannot be said to be erroneous or contrary to law.

4. In the opinion of this Court, if two different set of papers were given to different candidates in the same recruitment a difference in the level of questions is bound to occur.

5. There is no illegality or irregularity in Commission's approach in adopting process of normalisation by using Equipercntile Equating method (Statistical Equivalence Percentile method).

6. The writ petition therefore fails.

7. Stay petition also stands dismissed.

**(DINESH MEHTA),J**

15-Ramesh/-