



UPSC & STATE PCS CURRENT AFFAIRS · UJIYARI.COM

EDITORIAL ANALYSIS

The NTA Accountability Deficit: Why Examiner Failures Need a Statutory Remedy

THE HINDU

23 June 2026 · POLITY · SOCIAL ISSUES · GS2

CURATED & WRITTEN BY

**Bharat Choudhary**

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

[linkedin.com/in/epicbharat](https://www.linkedin.com/in/epicbharat)

ALSO FROM THE CREATOR

BharatNotesFree UPSC notes, MCQs, PYQ analysis. **100% Free.**bharatnotes.com →

ADVERTISE


Advertise with Ujiyari

Reach thousands of UPSC aspirants daily.

epicbharat@gmail.com



The NTA Accountability Deficit: Why Examiner Failures Need a Statutory Remedy

 **The Hindu** 23 June 2026 **GS2**

Source: ujyari.com — researched, fact-checked & UPSC-mapped



INTERVIEW ANGLE

"When an exam body's failure costs a student a year of life, should the State owe that student a legal remedy, or is a re-test enough?"

 **Every fact web-verified against primary sources** (<https://ujyari.com/how-we-verify/>)

WHY THIS EDITORIAL MATTERS

Every year, the National Testing Agency (NTA) conducts examinations that decide the futures of millions of young Indians. NEET-UG alone is taken by close to 24 lakh aspirants. The 2024 NEET-UG paper-leak crisis revealed that when this machinery fails, the people who pay the price are the candidates, and the institution that failed them bears almost no consequence. The Hindu's editorial, "The Lack of Accountability Within the NTA," makes a precise institutional argument: the problem is not only weak security, it is that the NTA's very legal form insulates it from answerability.

For a GS2 aspirant, this is a textbook case study in how the legal character of an institution determines its accountability. It connects three syllabus threads at once: **statutory** (<https://ujyari.com/vocab/statutory/>) versus non-statutory bodies, governance and citizen redress, and the welfare dimension of education as a public function.

THE CORE ARGUMENT

The lift line of the editorial is this: an examining body that holds the careers of millions in its hands cannot be a body that owes those millions nothing in law.

The NTA was set up to professionalise and standardise high-stakes testing. The Union Cabinet approved its creation in 2017, and it was registered in 2018 as a society under the Societies Registration Act, 1860. It conducts NEET-UG, JEE Main, UGC-NET and CUET. But it was not created by an Act of Parliament. That single fact carries a long chain of consequences.

Because it is a registered society and not a statutory body, no Minister is constitutionally answerable for the NTA in the way the government is answerable for bodies like the University Grants Commission or the AICTE. It carries no statutory liability for the harm caused by its failures. And it offers no built-in remedy to a student whose examination is derailed by a leak the agency failed to prevent. The accountability that does exist is discretionary, exercised only when public outrage or court intervention forces it, not guaranteed by law.

HOW TO THINK ABOUT THIS

The trap is to read this as a security story: better question banks, encrypted transport, biometric checks. Those matter, but they answer the wrong question. The editorial's deeper point is about institutional design.

Ask the analytical question an examiner would reward: what does the legal form of an institution buy, and what does it cost? A society registration buys speed and flexibility. The agency can hire technical staff, contract vendors and scale operations without the procedural weight that binds statutory bodies. But it costs answerability. There is no parliamentary owner, no defined liability, no statutory grievance channel.

Now apply the [asymmetry](https://ujivari.com/terms/asymmetry/) test. The benefit of flexibility accrues to the institution. The cost of failure falls on the candidate, and that cost is irreversible. A re-test does not return a lost year of preparation, a deferred medical career, or the mental toll on a family that invested everything in one attempt. When benefit and harm are distributed this unevenly, accountability cannot be left to discretion.

THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

A Society, Not a Statutory Body

The distinction is the heart of the matter.

FEATURE	STATUTORY BODY (E.G. UGC, AICTE)	REGISTERED SOCIETY (NTA)
Created by	An Act of Parliament	Registration under Societies Registration Act, 1860
Ministerial answerability	Minister answerable in Parliament	No direct constitutional answerability
Statutory liability	Defined duties and liability	No defined statutory liability
Candidate remedy	Possible statutory channels	Writ litigation; re-test at best
RTI coverage	Yes	Yes (NTA is within RTI purview)

The NTA is within the purview of the Right to Information Act, so it is not opaque in the disclosure sense. But transparency is not the same as accountability. Knowing what went wrong does not give a wronged candidate a remedy.

The 2024 Crisis and the Legislative Response

The 2024 NEET-UG paper-leak crisis was the trigger. Parliament had already passed the Public Examinations (Prevention of Unfair Means) Act, 2024, which criminalises organised cheating, paper leaks and impersonation, with stringent penalties for the networks that perpetrate them.

This Act is necessary but incomplete for the editorial's purpose. It targets the demand and supply of malpractice from outside the system. It does not make the conducting agency itself liable when its own processes fail. The leak networks are punished; the institutional weakness that let them succeed is not legally owned by anyone.

The Radhakrishnan Committee

Following the 2024 controversy, the Ministry of Education constituted a High-Level Committee of Experts in June 2024, chaired by former ISRO Chairman Dr K. Radhakrishnan. The committee submitted its report in October 2024 with a wide set of recommendations spanning examination security, data protection, institutional restructuring of the NTA, and candidate welfare including mental-health support.

Two recommendations are central here. First, a phased transition of NEET-UG from pen-and-paper to a computer-based testing (CBT) format. Second, a move to multi-session and multi-stage testing, which both reduces the value of a single leaked paper and requires normalisation across sessions. The NTA has indicated a shift towards CBT for NEET in the coming examination cycles. These are real reforms. But they are process reforms. They make the exam harder to compromise; they do not make the agency liable when it is compromised.

THE COUNTER-VIEW

A fair answer must engage the other side. Defenders of the current model argue three things.

First, the society structure gives the NTA the agility to recruit specialised technology and assessment talent and to scale to crores of candidates, which a rigid statutory framework might slow. Second, statutory creation is not a magic fix: many statutory bodies are also criticised for [inertia](https://ujivari.com/vocab/inertia/) (<https://ujivari.com/vocab/inertia/>), so form alone does not guarantee performance. Third, the combination of the 2024 Act and the Radhakrishnan reforms already strengthens integrity, so a new statute may be redundant.

These points have force, but they answer a different objection. Agility is about how the exam is run. The editorial's concern is about what happens to the candidate when it is run badly. None of the three defences creates a remedy for the harmed aspirant or fixes responsibility on the agency. Flexibility and accountability are not substitutes; a well-designed statute can preserve operational autonomy while still defining liability and [redress](https://ujivari.com/vocab/redress/) (<https://ujivari.com/vocab/redress/>).

THE WAY FORWARD

Ujjiyari Current Affairs - ujjiyari.com - Free Daily Current Affairs for UPSC & State PCS

The editorial points towards a layered reform agenda.

- ① **Statutory footing.** Place the NTA on a legal basis through an Act of Parliament that defines its duties, fixes its liability for systemic failures, and makes a Minister answerable for it.
- ② **Candidate grievance and compensation framework.** Create a statutory mechanism through which candidates harmed by agency failure can seek redress and defined compensation, rather than being left to costly individual litigation.
- ③ **Process reform delivered.** Implement the Radhakrishnan Committee's phased computer-based, multi-session model fully, so that the integrity of the exam matches the seriousness of its stakes.
- ④ **Separation of functions.** Ring-fence the agency's test-conduct function from an independent security, audit and integrity function, so that the body running the exam is not also the sole judge of whether it ran cleanly.

The unifying principle is simple: convert accountability from a favour the system grants under pressure into a right the candidate holds in law.

PYQ LINKAGE

This editorial maps cleanly onto recurring GS2 themes.

- *Compare and contrast the role of statutory and non-statutory bodies in the governance framework, with examples.* The NTA is a ready non-statutory illustration.
- *"Institutions matter less than the accountability mechanisms that bind them." Discuss in the context of recent governance failures.* The leak crisis is a contemporary anchor.
- On the **Prelims** side, candidates should be able to distinguish statutory, constitutional, regulatory and executive (society-based) bodies, and place the NTA correctly as a registered society under the Societies Registration Act, 1860.

The exam-craft takeaway: when an institution fails, the sharpest analytical move is to ask not only "what went wrong" but "what in its design allowed it to fail without consequence." That is the question The Hindu is really asking of the NTA.

Source: The NTA Accountability Deficit: Why Examiner Failures Need a Statutory Remedy — Ujjiyari.com | Free UPSC & State PCS Editorial Analysis

KEY ARGUMENTS AT A GLANCE

 Ujjayari Current Affairs · ujjayari.com · Free Daily Current Affairs for UPSC & State PCS

The NTA's recurring examination failures expose a structural flaw: as a registered society without statutory standing, it bears no enforceable liability and offers wronged candidates no remedy, making accountability discretionary rather than guaranteed.

 **SUPPORTING**

- Legal form determines answerability. A body created by an Act of Parliament is bound by statutory duties, ministerial answerability and defined liability; a society under the Societies Registration Act, 1860 is not, so no Minister is constitutionally answerable for the NTA the way government is for the UGC or AICTE.
- The harm is asymmetric and irreversible. A leaked or compromised paper can cost an aspirant an entire year of preparation and a seat, yet the candidate has no statutory channel to seek compensation, only litigation and a possible re-test that does not restore lost time.
- Punitive law without institutional reform is incomplete. The Public Examinations (Prevention of Unfair Means) Act, 2024 criminalises leak networks but does not make the conducting agency itself accountable for systemic security failures, leaving the supply side of integrity unaddressed.

 **COUNTER**

Defenders argue the society model gives the NTA operational flexibility to hire technical talent and scale fast, that statutory rigidity could slow reform, and that the Radhakrishnan Committee changes plus the 2024 Act already address integrity without needing a new statute.

 **WAY FORWARD**

Place the NTA on a statutory footing with a defined liability and candidate grievance-redress framework; implement the Radhakrishnan Committee's phased computer-based, multi-session model; create a compensation and appeals mechanism for candidates harmed by agency failure; and ring-fence the agency's testing function from its security and audit function.


MAINS ANSWER FRAMEWORK

 Ujijari Current Affairs - ujijari.com · Free Daily Current Affairs for UPSC & State PCS

QUESTION

The National Testing Agency conducts high-stakes examinations affecting millions of aspirants, yet remains a registered society with no statutory accountability for its failures. Critically examine how the absence of a statutory framework weakens institutional accountability in India's examination governance, and suggest reforms to balance administrative autonomy with answerability to candidates. (250 words)

INTRODUCTION

Examination governance is a sovereign trust: when the State certifies merit for medical, engineering and university admission, it assumes a duty of integrity towards millions of candidates. The recurring NEET-UG controversies have tested whether the National Testing Agency, the body discharging that trust, is institutionally answerable for its failures.

BODY

The accountability gap is structural, not merely operational. The NTA was registered in 2018 as a society under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, on Cabinet approval of 2017; it is not a statutory body created by an Act of Parliament.

Consequently no Minister is constitutionally answerable for it as government is for the UGC or AICTE, and it carries no defined statutory liability. When a paper leak compromises an examination taken by nearly 24 lakh NEET aspirants, the harmed candidate has no statutory remedy: only writ litigation and, at best, a re-test that cannot return a lost year.

The Public Examinations (Prevention of Unfair Means) Act, 2024 punishes leak networks but leaves the conducting agency's own systemic failures unaddressed. The Radhakrishnan Committee (2024) recommended a phased move to computer-based, multi-session testing and security upgrades, yet technological fixes cannot substitute for legal answerability.

Accountability requires both: secure process and an institution liable when the process fails.

CONCLUSION

A statutory NTA with a candidate-facing grievance and compensation framework would convert accountability from a matter of discretion into a matter of right, aligning examination governance with the constitutional promise of fairness in public functions.


RELATED DAILY ARTICLES

 23 Jun [Centre Tightens FCRA Rules for NGO Foreign Funding](#)

 23 Jun [NMC to Phase Out PG Diploma Medical Courses](#)

22 Jun **Current Affairs Today — June 22, 2026**

Ujjari Current Affairs · ujjari.com · Free Daily Current Affairs for UPSC & State PCS

21 Jun **12th International Day of Yoga 2026: "Yoga for Healthy...**

Ujiyari Current Affairs · ujiyari.com · **Free Daily** Current Affairs for UPSC & State PCS

CURATED & WRITTEN BY

Bharat Choudhary

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

[linkedin.com/in/epicbharat](https://www.linkedin.com/in/epicbharat)[Read Full Article on Ujiyari →](#)<https://ujiyari.com/editorials/2026/06/the-hindu-nta-accountability-exam-reform-2026/>

ALSO FROM THE CREATOR

BharatNotes

Free UPSC study platform — subject-wise notes across all 4 GS papers, Prelims MCQs, Mains answer frameworks, PYQ analysis & progress tracking. **100% Free • No Login Required.**

[Start Preparing → \[bharatnotes.com\]\(https://bharatnotes.com\)](#)

📌 OPPORTUNITY

Advertise with Ujiyari

Reach **thousands of serious UPSC & State PCS aspirants** daily through our PDFs, website, and social channels.

Ideal for: Coaching institutes • EdTech platforms • Book publishers • Exam prep apps

[✉ epicbharat@gmail.com](mailto:epicbharat@gmail.com)

Write to us for rates & media kit

Free UPSC & State PCS Current Affairs · ujiyari.com · bharatnotes.com