



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BECHU KURIAN THOMAS

MONDAY, THE 8TH DAY OF JUNE 2026 / 18TH JYAISHTA, 1948

WP(C) NO. 4399 OF 2026

PETITIONERS:

- 1 JOMON JAISON
AGED 17 YEARS, S/O JAISON SIBI,
CLASS XII, LAKE FORD SCHOOL,
VATTAKAYAL, LAKEFORD SCHOOL ROAD,
KOLLAM,
REPRESENTED BY HIS FATHER, JAISON SIBI,
AGED 45 YEARS, S/O T.D.JAMES,
JAISON NIVAS, NEENDAKARA,
KOLLAM, PIN - 691582
- 2 AKSHARA A.P
AGED 17 YEARS, D/O PRASAND A.B,
CLASS XII DR.RAJU DAVIS INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL,
GRACE KNOWLEDGE VILLAGE, MALA,
THRISSUR,
REPRESENTED BY FATHER PRASAND A.B ,
AGED 48 YEARS, S/O BHASKARAN A.K,
ARAPPATT, PUTHENVELIKARA P.O.,
PARAVUR TALUK, ERNAKULAM, PIN - 683594
- 3 GIRIVARDHAN
AGED 17 YEARS, S/O AJISHKUMAR,
CHAVARA PUBLIC SCHOOL,
PALA,
REPRESENTED BY FATHER AJISHKUMAR,
AGED 51 YEARS, S/O.GOPALAN NAIR.K,
RG 184A,VYGA,KOCHULLOOR,
MEDICAL COLLEGE P.O.,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-, PIN - 695001
- 4 NILA P.
AGED 17 YEARS, D/O HARIKUMAR S.,
CHAVARA PUBLIC SCHOOL,
PALA,
REPRESENTED BY FATHER HARIKUMAR S.,
AGED 56 YEARS, S/O SUKUMARAN UNNITHAN,



KADAYAT, CHANDANATHOPPU,
KOLLAM, PIN - 691014

- 5 AROMAL
AGED 17 YEARS, S/O SUJITH,
CHAVARA PUBLIC SCHOOL,
PALA,
REPRESENTED BY FATHER SUJITH,
AGED 49 YEARS, S/O.N.SUDHIR,
SUDEEPAM, KALLEKULANGARA P.O.,
AKATHETHARA, PALAKKAD, PIN - 678009
- 6 JWALA THOMAS
AGED 17 YEARS, D/O THOMAS P JOHN,
CHAVARA PUBLIC SCHOOL,
PALA,
REPRESENTED BY FATHER THOMAS P JOHN
AGED 63 YEARS, S/O JOHN,
PLATHARA, NEAR K.S.R.T.C.,
PERUMBAVOOR P.O.,
ERNAKULAM, PIN - 683542

BY ADVS.
SRI.T.S.HARIKUMAR
SRI.P.B.SAHASRANAMAN

RESPONDENTS :

- 1 THE STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANATHAPURAM, PIN - 695001
- 2 THE COMMISSIONER FOR ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS
7TH FLOOR, K,S,R,T,C. BUS TERMINAL COMPLEX,
THAMPANOOR,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001

BY ADVS.
SRI.P.G.PRAMOD, SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
26.05.2026, ALONG WITH WP(C)NO.1480/2026, THE COURT ON 08.06.2026
DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BECHU KURIAN THOMAS

MONDAY, THE 8TH DAY OF JUNE 2026 / 18TH JYAISHTA, 1948

WP(C) NO. 1480 OF 2026

PETITIONERS:

- 1 BEVEN SHIJU GEORGE (MINOR)
AGED 17 YEARS
REPRESENTED BY GUARDIAN SOJA GEORGE,
PADINJATTATHIL BUNGALOW,
EANATH P.O.,
PATHANAMTHITTA, PIN - 691526
- 2 ANJIKA ANIL (MINOR)
AGED 17 YEARS
REPRESENTED BY FATHER ANIL KUMAR,
HARICHANDANAM,
ANCHAL P.O., KOLLAM, PIN - 691306

BY ADVS.
SRI.P.MOHANDAS
SRI.K.SUDHINKUMAR
SRI.SABU PULLAN
SHRI.R.BHASKARA KRISHNAN
SHRI.BHARATH MOHAN
DR.K.P.SATHEESAN (SR.)

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY,
HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001
- 2 THE ENTRANCE COMMISSIONER
OFFICE OF THE ENTRANCE COMMISSIONER,



7TH FLOOR, K.S.R.T.C. BUS TERMINAL COMPLEX,
THAMPANOOR,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695035

3 THE CONTROLLER OF ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS
7TH FLOOR, K.S.R.T.C. BUS TERMINAL COMPLEX,
THAMPANOOR,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695035

BY ADVS .

SRI.P.G.PRAMOD, SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER
SHRI.N.MANOJ KUMAR, STATE ATTORNEY

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
26.05.2026, ALONG WITH WP(C)NO.4399/2026, THE COURT ON 08.06.2026
DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**"C.R."****BECHU KURIAN THOMAS, J.****W.P.(C) Nos.4399 & 1480 of 2026**

Dated this the 8th day of June, 2026

JUDGMENT

Petitioners challenge Clause 1.4 and 9.7.4 of the Prospectus for Admission to Professional Degree Courses 2026 (for brevity hereafter referred to as 'Prospectus 2026') issued by the Government of Kerala. The challenge raised by the petitioners relates to subject weightage and standardisation formula incorporated in the Prospectus 2026 insofar as it relates to the preparation of rank list for Engineering courses. Since the reliefs sought for in these two writ petitions are similar and the issues are identical, they are considered and disposed of by this common judgment. Reference to Exhibits in this judgement shall be with regard to those produced in W.P.(C) No. 4399 of 2026.

2. Petitioners are students studying in CBSE schools and intended to take part in the entrance examination to be conducted in the State of Kerala. According to the petitioners, contrary to the earlier system, a standardisation procedure was brought in 2012, to maintain uniformity among the students from the different Boards like CBSE, ICSE and Kerala Board of Public Examination. Petitioners allege that the standardisation procedure brought in 2012 continued till 2025. However, after the conduct of the entrance examination of 2025, the Government brought in a change in the



standardisation methodology, which was challenged before this Court. The implementation of the new scheme after publishing the prospectus was interfered with by this Court. In the meanwhile, when the Prospectus 2026 was published, the Government introduced a normalization method, which according to the petitioners, create great prejudice to the students of CBSE as it is implemented without any expert study, contrary to the views expressed by the experts and that too based on a recommendation of a body called an Internal Committee, which did not have any expert. Petitioners allege that the change in the formula is a departure carried out arbitrarily, without any scientific evaluation and in a highly prejudicial manner affecting the entire student community at large. It is in such circumstances that the petitioners have approached this Court, challenging the Prospectus 2026.

3. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations, stating that the Government is entitled to stipulate prescriptions in the prospectus reflecting the policy of the Government in the matter relating to admission to professional courses and the new normalization method, adopted by the State, cannot put the petitioners into any disadvantages position. It is asserted that the new method has been brought in and adopted for the purpose of removing the disparity which otherwise resulted in the earlier standardisation formula. According to the second respondent, admissions to the professional degree courses for the year 2026-27 is being proceeded with as per the provisions of the prospectus approved by the Government as early as on 01.01.2026. Prior to that, an Internal



Committee consisting of the Commissioner for Entrance Examination, the Director of Technical Education and the Director of SCERT, was constituted to review the standardisation process. The said Committee reviewed the standardisation method, its formula and the various complaints and as it revealed a downward revision of the actual marks secured by students of Boards with high statistical averages, it was realized that the said method caused persistent disadvantage for students from such Boards and undue advantage to some others. The Committee finally decided to adopt the normalization method identical to the one adopted by the State of Tamil Nadu.

4. According to the respondents, the present normalization procedure adopted in the prospectus for 2026, is designed to be impartial and ensures that no specific Board receives any special preference or advantage. Respondents have averred that the normalization process adopted in 2026 treats the highest mark obtained in each respective Board as 100%, thereby ensuring that no student from any Board receives any undue advantage and it inherently accounts for the varying levels of examination difficulty across different Boards. According to the respondents, the State has the competence to prescribe the mode of admission and adopt a normalization method, which is fair and scientific and brings students from various educational Boards on to a common platform. It is also stated that the Government had taken a policy decision to remove the illegality in the disparity between students of different Boards and to replace the previous method with a just, legal and time-tested method for normalization of marks, which cannot be questioned by the



petitioners. It is also reiterated that the said method treats all Engineering aspirants evenly and that the allegation that a certain group of candidates are given undue advantage is baseless.

5. I have heard Sri. T. S. Harikumar and Sri. K. Sudhinkumar, the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as Sri.P. G. Pramod, the learned Senior Government Pleader on behalf of the respondents.

6. At the outset itself it needs to be mentioned that the petitioners in W.P.(C) No.1480 of 2026 are, concededly, students of the XI standard. They cannot be aggrieved by the Prospectus 2026 as they are not competent to write the Entrance Examination for the year 2026. Therefore the challenge raised by the petitioners in the said writ petition has to fail as they do not have any locus standi to question Prospectus 2026. Notwithstanding the above, since the writ petitioners in W.P.(C) No.4399 of 2026 can maintain a challenge against the Prospectus 2026, as they are aspirants to the Engineering course for the year 2026, it is only appropriate that the contentions raised by the petitioners in both the writ petitions are considered.

7. The Government of Kerala conducts entrance examinations every year, for the engineering as well as the medical streams. Such a process commenced in the early 1980's. Initially, in the State, admission to the professional courses was based on the marks secured by the student in the qualifying examination which was pre-degree/XII standard. Subsequently, after the system of entrance examination was introduced, admissions were based on the marks secured by a candidate at the entrance examination alone.



Over the years, the Government felt it essential to adopt a system wherein 50% marks, each from the qualifying examination and the entrance score were calculated, to identify the successful candidate. However, since the method of valuation of the qualifying examinations in the different Boards were radically different, the Government introduced, in the year 2012, a system of standardisation. The said system also raised concerns and complaints. Hence a Committee was appointed to review the then existing standardization method. By Ext.P4 report dated 02-06-2025, the said Committee opined that introducing a new formula or making any modification to the existing scheme would be possible only after a thorough and detailed study and since it needed more time, it was felt that implementing a new formula was not feasible for that year. However, it was suggested to revise the existing weightage ratio between normalized marks at the entrance examination and standardized marks of the qualifying examination from 50:50 to 60:40. Contrary to the above recommendation, the Government introduced a system by retaining the 50:50 ratio but used a formula of 5:3:2 for the subjects Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry respectively scored at the qualifying examination. The prospectus for the year 2025 was amended as per the order dated 01-07-2025. However, this Court interfered with the change brought out after issuing the prospectus, after noting that the 'rules of the game cannot be changed after the game starts'.

8. Subsequent to the above, the Government by an order dated 06-12-2025, constituted an Internal Committee which, after deliberations, submitted



its recommendations to adopt the normalization formula approved and followed in Tamil Nadu, based on a ratio of 5:3:2 of Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry. It was also recommended that the changes be included at the time the prospectus itself is published. The Government thereafter, by Ext.P7 order dated 26-12-2025, concluded that the existing practice resulted in loss of marks for the students and hence decided to approve the recommendations of the internal Committee. The major changes recommended and approved are as follows:

"Clause 1.4 (a):- Admission to Engineering courses shall be regulated on the basis of merit as assessed by giving equal weightage of 50:50 to the normalized score obtained in the Entrance Examination for Engineering and the grade/marks obtained in the final year of the qualifying examination for Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry put together in the ration 5:3:2, after effecting the normalization procedure as described in Clause 9.7.4(b), for computing the Index mark out of 600. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, the marks obtained in Computer Science shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry and Computer Science, the marks obtained in Biotechnology shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, Computer Science and Biotechnology, the marks obtained in Biology shall be considered. The merits as shown in the mak list obtained from the Board of Examination of respective Higher Secondary Board shall be considered for academic eligibility.

Clause 9.7.4 (b). (i) Equal weightage of 50:50 shall be given to the normalized score obtained in the Entrance Examination for Engineering as described in CLause 9.4.4 (i) and the grade/marks obtained in the final year of the qualifying examination for



Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry put together, in the ratio 5:3:2, after effecting the normalization procedure as described in Clause 9.7.4(b)(iii). In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, the marks obtained in Computer Science shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry and Computer Science, the marks obtained in Biotechnology shall be considered. In case, the candidate has not studied Chemistry, Computer Science and Biotechnology, the marks obtained in Biology shall be considered.

(ii) The final year marks of the qualifying examination of each subject Mathematics, Chemistry/Computer Physics and Science/Biotechnology/Biology, after effecting the normalization in each subject, shall be put together in the ratio 5:3:2 (Mathematics:150, Physics:90, Chemistry:60) so that the combined marks of the three subjects is out of 300.

(iii) The marks obtained by the students in the relevant subjects in the qualifying examinations conducted by the various Boards or Authority shall be normalised using the following formula.

The normalized mark Y_B of a candidate of a particular board, B, is:

$$Y_B = \frac{X_B^j}{H_B^j} \times 100$$

Where H_B^j denotes the maximum of the marks secured by the students of a board (B) in a particular year (j) for a particular subject, and X_B^j denotes the mark secured by a candidate of the board (B), for that subject in that year (j).

Qualifying examinations of different years of the same board will be treated as different from each other."

9. The above approved changes were incorporated into the Prospectus 2026, and applications were invited based on the said prospectus.

10. In this context, it is relevant to mention that the Internal Committee had, in its report, identified that the then existing process led to significant



reduction in the final scores of the students and also that there were widespread complaints that the students were being subjected to disadvantageous positions. The Committee also identified that students from certain Boards were being subjected to reduced marks under the previous system of standardisation, resulting in disadvantages for students from certain Boards. Thus the Committee recommended to discontinue the previous standardisation methodology and instead to adopt a simpler and more transparent process of normalization of marks. The Committee found it fit to adopt the normalization process implemented in the State of Tamil Nadu, being the most appropriate in the circumstances.

11. The Internal Committee suggested adopting the normalization process by which the highest marks obtained in each Board is treated as 100%, thereby ensuring that no student from any particular Board receives an undue advantage and which inherently accounts for the varying levels of difficulty in examinations across different Boards. According to the Committee, under the system, the students receive either their actual marks or adjusted scores that increase in proportion to the difficulty of their specific Board's exam and also ensures that students from any Board are not subjected to a downward revision of their marks. The aforesaid formula was accepted and approved by the Government. During the course of hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioners fairly agreed with the observation of the Court that in the present system of normalization, there cannot be any downward revision of marks. Of course, there could be circumstances where there is no



corresponding increase in the marks of the students of a particular Board. Nevertheless, that depends upon the highest marks obtained in each Board.

12. The contention that the Internal Committee, comprised of non-experts, had recommended contrary to the views of the Review Committee constituted earlier, and without any detailed study, recommended the present system of normalization, though appeared to be impressive, on a proper analysis, has to be discarded as not legally tenable. The system of normalization recommended by the Internal Committee is not a new system. It has been in vogue in the State of Tamil Nadu for several years without any complaint. As noted earlier, the said system does not reveal any reduction in marks for any student from any Board. In the absence of any explicit arbitrariness or prejudice being shown to have been caused to any student due to the method of normalization adopted by the Prospectus 2026, this Court ought to restrain itself from interfering with such a process.

13. The system was introduced in Tamil Nadu in the year 2007 after abolishing the Common Entrance Examination to Professional Colleges. The challenge to the introduction of the system of normalization was repelled by the High Court of Madras. While considering the challenge to the concept of normalization, the High Court of Madras had, in **Minor S. Aswin Kumar v. State of Tamil Nadu** [2007 (2) CTC 677], observed as follows:

"48. Now, the State Government framed a scheme viz., "Normalization method" to achieve uniform evaluation of the merit of students who have passed the qualifying examination. It is the State policy to frame a scheme to achieve uniform evaluation of the merits



of the students who have passed in the qualifying examination. Usually, the Court has no power to interfere with the policy decision of the Government unless it is arbitrary and ultra vires of the Constitution and the same was not in violation of Article 14(2) of the Constitution. There is nothing to state that the new scheme framed by the State Government to achieve the common evaluation of the merits of the students who have passed the qualifying examination is arbitrary and in violation of Article 14(2) of the Constitution.

49. The processing should be fair, transparent and non-exploitative. The present scheme satisfies the above three conditions."

14. Thus, the new scheme implemented in Tamil Nadu and found judicial acceptance in the judgment in **Minor S. Aswin Kumar (supra)** has been adopted in Kerala to the extent of normalizing the marks obtained at the qualifying examination of the different Boards. The petitioners have not been able to prove any arbitrariness or unfairness in the said system warranting an interference by this Court.

15. Moreover, in academic matters, unless there is a clear violation of the statutory provisions or that of the Constitution of India, the Courts ought to keep its hand off. Such matters that fall in the realm of the domain of experts, ought not be treaded upon, as this Court does not possess such an expertise. Reference to the decisions in **University of Mysore v. C.D. Govinda Rao** [AIR 1965 SC 491] and **University Grants Commission v. Neha Anil Bobde** [(2013) 10 SCC 519] are relevant in this context.

16. Similarly, introduction of the new scheme of normalization of marks is a matter of policy. Minor errors can also arise while introducing a new scheme. At times, the errors would become visible or identifiable only after it is



put to test. However, merely because there can be minor errors in a system of examination and evaluation introduced by the Government, the court ought not to sit in judgment over the wisdom of such a scheme or system unless serious prejudice is expressly shown to exist in the new scheme or method. Though absolute equality is the ideal situation, that may not be possible to be achieved, especially when there are different Boards following different curricula.

17. It needs no elaborate discussion that, in academic matters, judicial review should be resorted to only in exceptional circumstances. As the Court is not an expert, it should be loath to interfere with the decisions of the academic bodies, unless there is *ex facie* arbitrariness or malafides involved. Similarly, in matters of policy also, the court should be reluctant to interfere, unless the policy is patently absurd or malafide. The court ought not to substitute or supplant its judgment or views for that of the body entrusted with the power to take decisions on academic matters, especially those relating to the method of evaluation of answer sheets. As long as a body entrusted with the power to identify a methodology for conduct and evaluation of an examination, acts within the sphere of its authority, without arbitrariness or malafides or other extrinsic reasons, the court should always refrain from interfering, lest the whole process gets jeopardised.

18. In this context, it is also appropriate to observe that the wisdom of the Government in identifying and evolving methodologies for examination, and the correctness of policies adopted by it are ordinarily not amenable to



judicial review. Such policies can be interfered with only if it is demonstrated that the policy is contrary to any statutory provision or the Constitution of India or is totally absurd that no reasonable or prudent person could have adopted it.

19. In **Maharashtra S.B.O.S. and H.S. Education and Another v. Paritosh** [(1984) 4 SCC 27], it has been held that the Court cannot sit in judgment over the wisdom of the policy evolved by the legislature and the subordinate regulation-making body. It was also observed in the said decision that it may be a wise policy which will fully effectuate the purpose of the enactment or it may be lacking in effectiveness and hence calling for revision and improvement. But any drawbacks in the policy will not render it ultra vires and the Court cannot strike it down on the ground that in its opinion, it is not a wise or prudent policy, but is even a foolish one, and that it will not really serve to effectuate the purposes of the Act. The Court went on to hold that the legislature and a delegate are the sole repositories of the power to decide what policy should be pursued and there is no scope for interference by the Court unless it is wholly beyond the scope of the regulation-making power or that it is inconsistent with any of the provisions of the parent enactment or in violation of the Constitution.

20. In the instant case, there is no dispute regarding the power of the Government to change the scheme and system of examination and evaluation. Hence, the challenge against the method of normalization introduced through the Prospectus 2026, is not legally tenable.



21. As regards the contention based on absence of experts in the Internal Committee is concerned, it is noted that the said Committee consisted of the Commissioner for Entrance Examinations, the Director for Technical Education and the Director of the State Council for Educational Research and Training (SCERT). The above referred persons are well versed with entrance examinations and the field of education and thus cannot be held to be incompetent persons to review the system that was in existence. Hence the contention based on the lack of experts in the Internal Committee is also not legally tenable.

In view of the above discussion, there is no merit in the challenge raised by the petitioners and hence these writ petitions are dismissed.

**Sd/-
BECHU KURIAN THOMAS
JUDGE**

vps

APPENDIX OF WP(C) NO. 4399 OF 2026

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

Exhibit P.1	THE TRUE PHOTOSTAT COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE PROSPECTUS OF THE YEAR 2012
Exhibit P.2	THE TRUE PHOTOSTAT OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE PROSPECTUS OF THE YEAR 2025
Exhibit P.3	THE TRUE PHOTOSTAT COPY OF G.O(MS).NO.470 OF 2025/HEDN., DATED 01-07-2025
Exhibit P.4	THE TRUE PHOTOSTAT COPY OF THE REPORT OF THE STANDARDIZATION REVIEW COMMITTEE BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT, DATED NIL
Exhibit P.5	A TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION, DATED 12.11.2025
Exhibit P.6	THE TRUE PHOTOSTAT COPY OF THE STATUS REPORT ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT, DATED 04-12-2025
Exhibit P.7	A TRUE COPY OF THE G.O.(RT).NO.1615/2025/HEDN., DATED 26.12.2025
Exhibit P.8	THE TRUE PHOTOSTAT COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNAL COMMITTEE DATED 13-12-2025 OBTAINED UNDER THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT
Exhibit P.9	TRUE PHOTOSTAT OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE PROSPECTUS OF THE YEAR 2026
Exhibit 10	THE ILLUSTRATION DETAILING A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, DEPICTING THE SIGNIFICANT DISPARITY BETWEEN THE ERSTWHILE STANDARDIZATION FORMULA AND THE NEWLY PROPOSED FORMULA



APPENDIX OF WP(C) NO. 1480 OF 2026

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

Exhibit -P1	TRUE COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER G.O. (RT)NO. 1615/2025/HEDN DATED 26-12-2025
Exhibit -P2	TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE PROSPECTUS FOR ADMISSION TO PROFESSIONAL DEGREE COURSES 2026 PUBLISHED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT