

Court No. - 18

Case :- WRIT - C No. - 2774 of 2024

Petitioner :- Kaushalendra Kumar

Respondent :- State Of U.P. Thru. Addl. Chief/ Prin. Secy., Deptt. Of Empowerment, Persons With Disabil. And Ors

Counsel for Petitioner :- Gaurav Mehrotra,Utsav Mishra

Counsel for Respondent :- C.S.C.,Atul Kumar Dwivedi,Sanjeev Kumar Srivastava

and-

Case :- WRIT - C No. - 1898 of 2024

Petitioner :- Vikas Chandra Kushwaha

Respondent :- State Of U.P. Thru. Addl. Chief Secy./Prin.Secy. Empowerment Of Persons With Disabilities And 6 Ors

Counsel for Petitioner :- Gaurav Mehrotra,Utsav Mishra

Counsel for Respondent :- C.S.C.,Atul Kumar Dwivedi,Sanjeev Kumar Srivastava

Hon'ble Subhash Vidyarthi,J.

1. Both the above mentioned writ petitions arise out of the same cause of action, hence they both are disposed of by a common order. For the sake of convenience of Writ-C No. 2774 of 2024 is taken as the leading case.
2. Heard Sri Gaurav Mehrotra Advocate, the learned counsel for the petitioners in both the Writ Petitions, Sri Abhishek Kumar Pandey, the learned Addl. Chief Standing Counsel for the State of U.P.; Sri Sudeep Seth Senior Advocate assisted by Sri Atul Kumar Dwivedi Advocate, the learned Counsel for Dr. Shakuntala Misra National Rehabilitation University and Sri Sanjeev Kumar Srivastava, the learned counsel for the opp. party No. 8.
3. By means of the instant writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India the petitioners have challenged the validity of a communication dated 05.12.2023 sent by the Department of Hearing Impairment, Faculty of Special Education, Dr. Shakuntala Misra

National Rehabilitation University, informing that in response to the petitioner's application for extension of time for completing Ph.D. course, the Department has received a communication with remarks *"The maximum period of six years stipulated under course 4.2 of Ph.D. regulation 2016 of UGC, under course clause 8.2 of Ph.D. ordinance 2018 of this university and subsequent permissible extension under the effect of public notice of UGC issued vide letter No. F.1-10/2021(CPP-II) dated 17 May 2022 has been ended on 31-December, 2022. Hence the application put up by the candidate as mentioned is not maintainable and consequently the proposal is not allowable."*

4. The petitioners have sought quashing of decision of the University, which has been communicated through the aforesaid letter. The petitioners have also sought issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus commanding the opp. parties to permit them to submit their Ph.D. theses and conclude the Ph.D. Course.
5. Briefly stated, facts of the case are that Kaushalendra Kumar - the petitioner in Writ-C No. 2774 of 2024 was appointed on the post of Sign Language Interpreter in Dr. Shakuntala Misra National Rehabilitation University by means of an order dated 19.09.2014. While working on the aforesaid post, he got admitted to Ph.D. course in the aforesaid University in the Academic Year 2016-17 and he deposited fee for the Session 2016-17 on 19.09.2016.
6. The petitioner in Writ-C No. 1898 of 2024, Vikas Chandra Kushwaha, is a Faculty Member in the University and he is working as a Physiotherapist, who performs clinical as well as academic duties. He was admitted as a Ph.D. Student in the year 2014-15. Rehabilitation Council of India recommends "Physiotherapists" as eligible for working as Visiting Faculty Members.
7. Dr. Shakuntala Misra National Rehabilitation University had issued Ph.D. Ordinance 2014, Clause 8 whereof contains provisions regarding duration of Ph.D. It provides that the duration of Ph.D. shall

commence immediately after depositing the first installment of the fee. The maximum duration for completing Ph.D. course will be 5 years. Clause 8.6 of the said ordinance provides that the duration of Ph.D. course can be extended on the basis of recommendation of research guide and Head of Department and after approval of Vice Chancellor and also after depositing the prescribed fee.

8. Academic Council of Dr. Shakuntala Misra National Rehabilitation University had taken a decision in its meeting dated 03.10.2015 that for reserving 10% seats in Ph.D. course for staff of the University and their dependents and it further decided that such teachers of the University, who did not hold Ph.D. degree but who have cleared JRF/GATE/NET/SLET/M.Phil from UGC or CSIR and the serving officers and reputed experts, whose research work might be beneficial for the University and the society and might be helpful in policy planning, be enrolled for Ph.D. course, directly, after creating additional seats, and it decided to authorize the Vice Chancellor of the University for the purpose. This decision of the Academic Council was approved by the Executive Council of the University in its meeting held on 05.05.2017.
9. The petitioners claim that they had qualified NET (National Eligibility Test) for Assistant Professor conducted by the University Grants Commission. Accordingly, they applied for admission to Ph.D. course. Eight seats were available in this course and they secured the ninth and tenth positions. They were granted admission by creating additional seats in pursuance of the aforesaid decision taken by the Academic Council and approved by the Executive Council of the University.
10. On 16.11.2018 the Registrar of the University issued an Office Memorandum stating that a decision had been taken by the Academic Council of the University that such research students, who had secured admission as per Clause 1.7 of Ph.D. Ordinance 2014 of the University, without appearing in any entrance examination/interview

and research scholars, who are outsiders to the University and who had not participated in any admission process and had secured direct admission, could not be awarded Ph.D. degree as per the Rules and Regulations of the University Grants Commission. An inquiry was being conducted in furtherance of the decision of the Academic Counsel. Till completion of inquiry, such candidates should not be allowed to participate in any further proceedings relating to R.D.C./D.R.C./Research.

11. On 15.10.2019, the Registrar sent a letter to all the Heads of the Departments of the University stating that all the research scholars, who had secured admission during the years 2014 to 2017, should be directed to submit affidavits on the prescribed proforma, which required particulars relating to admission of the students.
12. The petitioners submitted their affidavits stating that they had appeared in the Entrance Examination for Ph.D. course held in the year 2016. They could not secure admission on the basis of merit, but the Vice Chancellor of the University had granted special permission for their admission to Ph.D. course, as at the relevant time they were working in the University. The departmental research committee had permitted the petitioners to conduct research work.
13. On 01.11.2019 the Registrar of the University issued another Office Memorandum stating that the earlier Office Memorandum dated 16.11.2018 was kept in abeyance with immediate effect. However, the petitioners claim that they were not permitted to deposit course fee for carrying on the research work.
14. Meanwhile, due to spread of Covid-2019 Pandemic, the University Grants Commission had issued a public notice on 16.03.2021 providing that Universities may grant extension of six months for submission of theses. A further extension was also granted by another similar public notice issued by the University Grants Commission on 17.05.2022.

15. On 14.07.2023, the Head of Department, Department of Hearing impaired, issued a notice stating that ten research scholars registered from the year 2014 till date, including the petitioners, had not submitted documents relating to their research work and all of them were directed to submit the requisite documents within 15 days. The petitioners submitted the requisite documents.
16. The petitioner gave letters to the Chairperson, Departmental Research Committee, stating that they were conducting research work, which was at the final stage. They requested for extension of time for submission of research work and permission to deposit the balance amount of fee.
17. The petitioners' request has been rejected on the ground that the maximum period of six years, stipulated under Clause 4.2 of the Ph.D. Regulations 2016 of the University Grants Commission and under Clause 8.2 of the Ph.D. Ordinance 2018 of the University, has expired and the extended period granted as per the U.G.C. letter has also expired, hence the application of the petitioner for extension of time is not maintainable.
18. While assailing validity of the aforesaid order, Sri. Gaurav Mehrotra, the learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the impugned order refers to Ph.D. Ordinance 2018, whereas the petitioners got admitted to Ph.D. course on 5 July, 2016, when Ph.D. Ordinance 2014 was in force. Therefore, the petitioners' request for extension of time cannot be rejected by taking recourse to the provisions contained in Ph.D. Ordinance 2018.
19. Ph.D. Ordinance 2014 promulgated by Dr. Shakuntala Misra National Rehabilitation University provides that the maximum time-limit for completing Ph.D. course is five years and it can be extended by the Vice Chancellor on the recommendation of the Research Guide and the Head of the Department. The petitioners had applied for extension of time, but their requests have been rejected, without referring to the provisions contained in Clause 8.6 of the Ph.D. Ordinance 2014.

20. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that several other research scholars had also given application for extension of time. One of the candidates Pallavi Singh, who was not working in the University, had filed Writ-C No. 23756 of 2021, which was allowed by means of a judgment and order dated 31.05.2023 and a Mandamus was issued to the University to consider her application for extension of time for a period of one year, after completion of five years of Ph.D. course and to permit her to deposit fee in accordance with law. The aforesaid order dated 31.05.2023 has been complied with by means of an office order dated 15.06.2023 issued by the Registrar of the University.
21. Another research scholar, namely, Mahesh Kumar Chaudhary, had filed Writ-C No. 3799 of 2023. During hearing of this Writ Petition on 29.05.2023, the learned counsel for the University informed this Court that the university had already constituted a Committee to visit the issue of continuation of Ph.D. course of the petitioner - Mahesh Kumar Chaudhary and other similarly situated persons and a decision was expected to be taken within four weeks. The committee submitted its report on 01.07.2023 wherein it recommended that research scholars working in the University, who have cleared NET/SLET/JRF and who have been admitted to Ph.D. course directly, without participating in any admission test/interview, may be permitted to continue the Ph.D. course. The teachers or special teachers working in the University, who have pursued Ph.D. course and who have not qualified NET/SLET/JRF and who had been admitted directly without participating directly in any admission test/interview, be permitted to participate in the next Ph.D. entrance examination and in case they qualify in the same, they may be permitted to continue their Ph.D. course. All such teachers and other persons, who are permitted to complete Ph.D. course, were recommended to be granted extension for a period of one year to enable them to complete their Ph.D. course.
22. The reasons for making the aforesaid recommendations, as mentioned in the report, include a reason that a decision was taken in a meeting

of the Executive Council of the University held on 04.07.2019 that the teachers working in the University, who have been admitted to Ph.D. course directly without participating in any admission test/interview, have already been recommended by the Executive Council to continue their Ph.D. course. Dependents of teachers, and non-teaching staff, special teachers and other outside candidates, who have been admitted to Ph.D. course directly without participating in any admission test/interview by the then Vice Chancellor of the University, will be given an opportunity to participate in the upcoming Ph.D. Entrance Examination and in case they qualify in the same, they may be recognized as Ph.D. students and be given permission to complete the Ph.D. course. It is mentioned in the recommendations that cancelling admission of any student after expiry of a period of 7, 8 or 9 years would be violative of his human rights as well as the principles of Natural Justice.

23. On the basis of the aforesaid recommendations, an Office Order dated 07.07.2023 was issued by the Registrar of the University providing that the teachers working in the University, who have been directly admitted to Ph.D. course, without participating in any admission test/interview, after qualifying NET/SLET/JRF, should be permitted to continue their Ph.D. course. Those Teachers/Special Teachers, who are pursuing Ph.D. course, who have not qualified NET/SLET/JRF and who had been admitted directly, without participating in any admission test/interview, were recommended to be granted an opportunity to participate in the upcoming Ph.D. entrance test, and on being successful in it, they should be permitted to continue their research work.
24. All the teachers, who were pursuing Ph.D. course, were recommended to be granted extension of one year's period for completing their Ph.D. course. Accordingly, writ petition of Mahesh Kumar Chaudhary was allowed by means of an order dated 17.07.2023 in view of the aforesaid order dated 07.07.2023.

25. Yet another Ph.D. student Sanjay Kumar had filed Writ-C No.3800 of 2023, which too was allowed by means of a judgment and order dated 17.08.2023 and the University has complied with the order dated 17.08.2023 by issuing an order dated 02.09.2023 permitting Sri Sanjay Kumar to submit his thesis. It has also been stated that Sanjay Kumar is not NET qualified, yet the benefit of extension has been granted to him.
26. In light of the aforesaid facts, submission of the learned counsel for the petitioners is that the University has granted extension of time to all other candidates and the request for extension of time has been rejected only so far as the petitioners are concerned, which establishes that the University has acted in an arbitrary manner and has discriminated against the petitioners.
27. Replying to the aforesaid submissions, Sri Sudeep Seth, learned Senior Advocate, appearing for the respondent-University stated at the outset that the University is not treating this case as an adversarial litigation, but the University is bound to act as per the provisions of the relevant Rules and Regulations. He has submitted that Clause 8.5 of the Ph.D. Ordinance 2014 provides a maximum limit of five years for completion of Ph.D. course, which period expired in the year 2021 in respect of the petitioners. The petitioners have not assailed validity of Clause 8.5 of the Ph.D. Ordinance 2014. In absence of a challenge made to the aforesaid Clause 8.5, the petitioners cannot challenge validity of the order rejecting extension of time only. In support of this contention, learned counsel for the University has relied upon a judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of **Amarjeet Singh & ors. v. Devi Ratan & ors.**: (2010) 1 SCC 417.
28. The learned counsel for the University secondly submitted that the petitioners had deposited the requisite fee for the year 2017-18 only and although they have pleaded that thereafter they were not permitted to deposit the fee, there is no such averment in their representations. From this, it appears that the petitioners themselves willingly

refrained from depositing the fee, which indicates that they had willingly abandoned pursuing Ph.D. course. In these circumstances, the petitioners cannot subsequently take a U-turn and seek extension of time for completion of Ph.D. course.

29. The third submission of the learned Counsel for the University is that the University had issued an Office Memorandum dated 08.08.2019 granting extension of time for depositing fee for Ph.D. programme, but the petitioners did not deposit the fee even in the extended period and, therefore, their request for extension of time for depositing the fee has rightly been turned down.
30. The learned counsel for the University next submitted that a committee constituted by the University has considered the request for extension of time for completing Ph.D. course and has recommended extension of time in respect of certain classes of students, including teachers of the University who are pursuing Ph.D. course and have completed NET/SLET/JRF and teachers and special teachers, working in the University who have not qualified NET/SLET/JRF, but the Committee has not recommended extension of time in respect of employees of the University other than teachers. Therefore, the petitioner's request for extension of time has rightly been rejected in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee.
31. Regarding the judgments in the cases of Pallavi Soni, Mahesh Kumar Chaudhary and Sanjay Kumar, the learned counsel for the University has submitted that all those cases have been decided without taking into consideration the provisions contained in Clause 8.5 of the Ph.D. Ordinance 2014. Therefore, those judgments fall within the category of "*sub silentio judgments*", which do not amount to binding precedents. In support of this contention, he has relied upon the judgment in the case of **Bilkis Yakub Rasool v. Union of India & ors.**: (2024) 5 SCC 481.
32. In reply to the aforesaid submissions of the learned counsel for the University, the learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that

Clause 8.6 of the Ph.D. Ordinance 2014 specifically authorizes the Vice Chancellor to extend the period for completing the Ph.D. course. The sole reason assigned for rejecting the petitioner's request for extension of time is that the time fixed by the relevant regulations/ordinance for completing the Ph.D. course has expired, without advertent to the provision authorizing the Vice Chancellor to extend the period. When there is a specific provision in Clause 8.6 for extension of time, the petitioners have no reason to be aggrieved by the provisions contained in Clause 8.5 fixing the time limit for complete Ph.D. course and, therefore, they have no reason to challenge the validity of the Clause 8.5 of the Ph.D. Ordinance 2014.

33. Regarding the objection that the petitioners have not deposited the fee in time, the learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that this ground is not mentioned in the impugned order dated 05.12.2023. The validity of an order is to be scrutinized by the Court on the basis of the reasons mentioned in the order itself and fresh reasons cannot be supplied at this stage, when the court is examining validity of the order dated 05.12.2023.
34. The learned counsel for the petitioner has also pointed out that the Registrar of the University has filed a supplementary counter affidavit wherein he has tried to distinguish the case of the petitioners from the case of Pallavi Soni, Mahesh Kumar Chaudhary and Sanjay Kumar as well as another candidate Nishant Bhola, who was granted extension of time for completing Ph.D. course without any order of the court. The Registrar has stated in para-14 of his supplementary counter affidavit verified on 21.08.2024, that Sri Nishant Bhola was NET qualified and a teacher in the University. He was admitted to the Ph.D. course and had deposited the first installment of fee on 28.08.2014. He had timely deposited the annual fee for his entire Ph.D. programme and pursued his research work. As per U.G.C. Regulations 2016, the maximum period for submission of thesis was till 20.03.2020, but this period was extended till 31.12.2022. Thereafter, he was granted extension for a period of one year.

35. The learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out that the fee receipts of Nishant Bhola annexed with the supplementary counter affidavit show that Nishant Bhola had deposited the first installment of fee on 20.08.2014. Fee for the Session 2015-16, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20 was deposited on 04.11.2020. Fee for the Session 2020-21 and 2021-22 was deposited on 08.11.2023 and fee for the Session 2023-24 was deposited on 08.12.2023. Therefore, the statement made by Sri Rohit Singh, Registrar, Dr. Shakuntala Misra National Rehabilitation University in para 14 of the supplementary counter affidavit dated 21.08.2024 is false on the face of the record.
36. The learned counsel for the petitioner has emphasized on the facts that (1) Sanjay Kumar is not NET qualified, and the benefit of extension has been granted to him. (2) Mahesh Kumar Chaudhary was NET qualified and he was admitted to Ph.D. course for the Session 2014-15 alongwith the petitioners and he has also been granted the benefit of extension, (3) Pallavi Soni is neither an employee nor Faculty Member of the University, but she is an NET qualified and she has been granted the benefit of extension of time and (4) Nishant Bhola who was granted extension of time for completing Ph.D. course without any order of the court.
37. Regarding circulars directing deposition of fee, submission of the learned counsel for the petitioners is that these circulars were issued during the period when the petitioners had already been restrained from pursuing the Ph.D. course and, therefore, the petitioners could not have availed the opportunity.
38. The learned counsel for the petitioners has drawn attention of the court to a document annexed as Annexure RA-2 to the rejoinder affidavit filed in reply to the short counter-affidavit, which is a copy of the minutes of meeting of departmental research committee held on 06.02.2024, wherein the departmental research committee has unanimously recommended for extension of time available to the petitioners for depositing fee, completing research work and taking

viva. However, in spite of the aforesaid recommendations, the University has not followed the same and has ignored the recommendations without assigning any reason.

39. Although a Counsel is well within his rights to advance submissions in support of the case of the party whom he is representing, the numerous objections raised by Sri. Sudeep Seth, the learned Senior Advocate representing the University, belies his statement that the University is not treating this case as an adversarial litigation and it will be further fortified by the discussion to follow.
40. The eligibility for admission to Ph.D. programme, enumeration of seats, eligibility for Ph.D. Supervisor, registration procedure, duration of Ph.D., Ph.D. presentation etc. are governed by Doctor of Philosophy Ordinance 2014 issued by Dr. Shakuntala Mishra University. Clause 8 of the Ordinance contains provisions for duration of Ph.D. Clause 8.5 provides that the maximum duration for completing Ph.D. course will be five years and Clause 8.6 provides that the duration of Ph.D. can be extended after approval of the Vice-Chancellor granted on the basis of the recommendation of the Research Guide and the head of Department and after depositing the requisite fee and taking into consideration the progress report of the research work.
41. The sole reason assigned for rejecting the petitioners' request for extension of time for completing Ph.D. course is that the maximum period of six years stipulated under clause 4.2 of Ph.D. regulation 2016 of UGC, under clause 8.2 of Ph.D. ordinance 2018 of the university and subsequent permissible extension under the effect of public notice of UGC dated 17 May 2022 has been ended on 31-December, 2022.
42. The petitioners got admitted to Ph.D. course in the year 2016, when Ph.D. Ordinance 2014 issued by the University was in force. Therefore, the Ph.D. course of the petitioners would be governed by

the provisions of the Ph.D. Ordinance 2014 and not by the Ph.D. Ordinance 2018.

43. A request for extension of time is made only when the time available for completion of the course has expired. In other words, the time permissible for completing Ph.D. course would be a ground for seeking an extension of time and is cannot be a ground for rejecting the request for extension.
44. The preliminary objection raised by the learned Counsel for the University that the petitioners have not challenged the validity of Clause 8.5 of the Ph.D. Ordinance 2014, is misconceived, as when Clause 8.6 of the Ordinance contains a provision for extension of time, the petitioners have no reason to be aggrieved by the provision contained in Clause 8.5 and they do not need to challenge the aforesaid provision.
45. The University Grants Commission has issued “University Grants Commission (Minimum Eligibility and Procedure for granting M.Phil/Ph.D. Degree) Regulations 2016. Clause 4.2 of the aforesaid Regulations provide that the maximum period for completing Ph.D. course will be six years. Clause 4.3 thereof provides that extension of time beyond the period prescribed by Clause 4.2 aforesaid will be governed by the relevant provisions contained in the statutes/ordinance of the concerned University. Therefore, even as per the U.G.C. Regulations the petitioners are entitled to claim extension of time as per the provisions contained in Ph.D. Ordinance 2014 issued by the University.
46. As has already been noted above, ten research students of the University, including the petitioners, admitted during the period 2014 to 2017, had sought extension of time for completion of Ph.D. Degree. Three candidates, namely, Pallavi Soni, Mahesh Kumar Chaudhary and Sanjay Kumar had filed writ petitions in this court, which have been allowed and the orders passed by this court have been complied with by the University. Pallavi Soni is neither an employee nor

Faculty Member of the University. Sanjay Kumar is not NET qualified, and the benefit of extension has been granted to him. Nishant Bhola has been granted the benefit of extension without any order of the court.

47. During hearing of Writ-C No. 3799 of 2023, filed by a student Mahesh Kumar Chaudhary, the learned counsel for the University had informed this court that a committee constituted by the University for considering the requests of several students for extension of time for completing Ph.D. course, has submitted a report dated 01.07.2023, recommending that the research scholars working in the University, who have cleared NET/SLET/JRF and who have been admitted to Ph.D. course directly, without participating in any admission test/interview, may be permitted to continue the Ph.D. course.
48. The petitioners are Research Scholars working in the University, and they have cleared N.E.T. and as per the recommendation of the University the petitioners are entitled to get extension of time, but their request for extension of time has been rejected.
49. Although the learned counsel for the University has tried to distinguish the case of the petitioners by stating that all the other persons, to whom extension has been granted, are working as Teachers, whereas the petitioners are working on posts other than teachers, the aforesaid recommendation dated 01.07.2023 covers all Research Scholars, working in the University, who have cleared N.E.T., which would include even persons working on non-teaching posts. Therefore, it appears that the aforesaid distinction drawn by the learned counsel for the University is against the recommendations made by the Committee constituted by the University itself.
50. It also significant to note that in its meeting held 06.02.2024, the departmental research committee of the University has unanimously recommended for extension of time available to the petitioners for depositing fee, completing research work and taking viva, yet the

University has rejected the petitioners' request for extension of time for completing the Ph.D. course.

51. The action of the University in declining to extend the time for completion of Ph.D. course of the petitioners appears to be discriminatory from the fact that all other Ph.D. students, including Pallavi Soni, who is neither an employee nor Faculty Member of the University and Sanjay Kumar, who is not NET qualified.
52. The conduct of the Registrar of the University in trying to mislead this court by making a false statement in the supplementary counter affidavit to the effect that Nishant Bhola had deposited all installments of fee timely, whereas the fee-receipts of Nishant Bhola indicate that he had deposited fee for the sessions 2015-16, 2016-17, 2018-19 and 2019-20 on 04.11.2020, which cannot be said to be timely deposit of annual fee. Further, fee for the Sessions 2020-21 and 2021-22 was deposited on 08.11.2023 and this deposit was also not made timely. It indicates that the Registrar of the University is acting in a vindictive manner by denying the benefit of extension of time for completion of Ph.D. course of the petitioners as provided in Clause 8.6 of the Ph.D. Ordinance 2014 of the University and thereafter by justify the aforesaid illegal action before this court by filing a false affidavit.
53. In view of the aforesaid discussion, this court is of the considered view that the action of the University in denying to extend the petitioner's time for completing Ph.D. course as per the provision contained in Clause 8.6 of the Ph.D. course 2014 is unsustainable in law. The petitioners are also entitled to be granted extension of time of one year like other students.
54. Accordingly, both the writ petitions are **allowed**.
55. The impugned communication issued by the Head of Department of Hearing Impairment, Faculty of Special Education, Dr. Shakuntala Mishra National Rehabilitation University, copies whereof have been filed as Annexure-1 to the writ petitions, are hereby **quashed**. A writ

of Mandamus is issued to the opp. parties to grant extension of time of one year to the petitioners for completing their Ph.D. course, to permit them to deposit their fee within a period of one month from the date of this order and to permit the petitioners to complete their research work and submit their thesis within the extended period.

56. The parties shall bear their own costs of litigation.
57. Let a copy of this order be placed on the records of Writ-C No. 1898 of 2024, Vikas Chandra Kushwaha v. State of U.P.

(Subhash Vidyarthi J)

Order Date: 16.10.2024
A.Nigam