BLOGS

CLAT 2025 Errors: Consortium Draws Criticism for Errors and Alleged Procedural Lapses

Ruchika Mohapatra · 10 Dec 2024

The Common Law Admission Test (CLAT) 2025, conducted on December 1 between 2-4 PM, has sparked widespread controversy among aspirants and educators. Alleged errors in question papers, discrepancies in the provisional answer key, and high objection fees have drawn ire from candidates, with some even resorting to legal action to stay the CLAT 2025 results.

Errors in the Question Paper

Candidates highlighted substantial problems in the undergraduate (UG) paper's logical reasoning section.

Four of the six analytical reasoning questions reportedly lacked correct answer options, leading to confusion and wasting valuable time.

Errors in the Provisional and Final Answer Key

The Provisional Answer Key released by the CLAT Consortium had many errors (almost 12!) and left the aspirants perplexed.

Read More: **CLAT 2025 Provisional Answer Key**

Per the Consortium's own **press release**, the Final Answer Key was to be released ***on or before*** 9th December, 2024 followed by the declaration of results on 10th December, 2024.

However, despite glaring errors in the answer key as well as a 24-hour window to file objections against the questions and provisional answer key, the final answer key and CLAT 2025 results were both declared on 7th December, 2024 which is before the scheduled time. This action could perhaps be a result of the petition to stay the CLAT 2025 results **over alleged procedural issues in the conduct of the examination**.

The declaration of results would perhaps have been appreciated by aspirants had there not been errors in the final answer key as well. Many students have claimed to have received lesser marks in comparison to what they were receiving after the publication of the provisional answer key.

Several students have claimed that these issues have jeopardized their career and are extremely unhappy with the way their efforts throughout the year and more have been wasted.

Procedural Issues

Postgraduate (PG) aspirants faced comparable challenges, with reported errors in the provisional answer key. Procedural issues during the exam, such as delays in distributing materials, have resulted in two candidates filing a writ petition in the Supreme Court to contest the fairness of the examination.

Disparities in Exam Difficulty

The UG paper was widely criticized for being easy, undermining the efforts of well-prepared students. Candidates stated that traditionally challenging sections, like legal reasoning and general knowledge, resembled basic reading comprehension exercises, offering little differentiation between varying levels of preparedness.

PG aspirants, on the other hand, encountered logistical issues that disrupted their performance. For instance, delays in providing question papers and OMR sheets ate into the limited exam time.

Additionally, unclear last-minute instructions caused confusion, as some students were reprimanded for marking answers on the question paper despite previous guidelines allowing the practice.

High Costs for Raising Objections

The CLAT Consortium’s objection fee of ₹1,000 per query has drawn significant criticism. Many students, already burdened by a ₹4,000 registration fee, found the additional cost prohibitive.

This has deterred some from raising genuine concerns, raising questions about the consortium’s commitment to transparency. Educators too have echoed these sentiments, calling for a review of the fee structure to ensure fairness.

Legal Action Against the Consortium

PG candidates Anam Khan and Ayush Agarwal filed a writ petition in the Supreme Court, citing procedural lapses as a violation of their rights under Articles 14 and 21A of the Constitution. They argued that delays in distributing exam materials significantly hampered their performance. The petition sought a stay on result publication and calls for systemic reforms.

On 10th December, 2024, a bench comprising Chief Justice Sanjiv Khanna and Justice Sanjay Kumar, directed the petitioners to approach the Delhi High Court with their concerns.

Declining to entertain the plea, the bench emphasized that the Supreme Court cannot serve as the court of first instance in such cases and highlighted the potential for delays in examination results if the apex court intervenes prematurely.

Read More: Petition Filed in Supreme Court to Stay CLAT 2025 Results Over Alleged Procedural Lapses

Critique from Educators

Many educators have voiced concerns about discrepancies between the Consortium's sample papers and the actual exam. The lack of alignment left students unprepared for unexpected challenges.

Many have suggested outsourcing the examination process to professional organizations like those administering the LNAT or LSAT. These entities specialize in creating standardized tests, potentially reducing errors and ensuring accountability.

Although these issues remain unresolved, the consortium initiated the counseling process on Monday. According to a notice, grievances could be submitted starting December 25; however, no specific deadline has been provided, leaving students uncertain about the complaint procedure.

The confusion caused by ranking discrepancies and ambiguous timelines has further heightened the frustration among students striving to secure admission to law schools.