

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.15710 of 2026  
Date of Decision: 10.09.2026

---

Vikas Chander

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors.

... Respondents

---

Coram:

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.**

Whether approved for reporting? <sup>1</sup>

---

**For the Petitioner:** Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate.

**For the Respondents:** Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General with Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for respondents No.1 & 2-State.

Mr. L.S. Mehta, Advocate, for respondent No.3.

Ms. Sunila Bhardwaj, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

---

**Sandeep Sharma, Judge**(oral):

Precisely, the case of the petitioner, as has been highlighted in the petition and further canvassed by Mr. Rajesh Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, is that despite there being repeated requests, B.Pharmacy Degree along with other relevant documents, including DMCs of 7th and 8th Semesters, is not being

---

<sup>1</sup>Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

released by the respondent-University, as a result whereof, future of the petitioner is at stake.

**2.** Having regard to the nature of prayer and the order proposed to be passed in the instant proceedings, this Court sees no necessity to call for reply on behalf of the respondents, who are otherwise represented by Mr. Ravi Chauhan, learned Deputy Advocate General, Mr. L.S. Mehta and Ms. Sunila Bhardwaj, Advocate.

**3.** As per the averments contained in the petition, petitioner completed his degree of Bachelor of Pharmacy course in 2020 from respondent No. 4-University under a specific registration number. Though his name is reflected in the green sheet, but his name did not appear in the admission disclosure result. Though petitioner was issued only DMCs, i.e. detailed marksheets, of the first to sixth semesters (Annexure P-1 colly), but till date, despite repeated requests, detailed marksheets of the seventh and eighth semesters are not being issued. In the first semester gazette, petitioner has been shown to have obtained 572 marks out of 1000, whereas in the detailed marksheets, as well as in the green sheet register, his marks have been shown as 570/1000. On account of the aforesaid mismatch, petitioner has not been issued detailed marksheets as well as the degree. Though the petitioner repeatedly made requests to the

respondent-University to rectify the errors, but nothing was done and as such, petitioner was compelled to approach this Court in the instant proceedings.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, while inviting the attention of this Court to judgment dated 22.04.2025 passed by this Court in CWP No. 2690 of 2024, titled ***Priya Thakur vs. State of Himachal Pradesh***, contends that the case at hand is squarely covered by the aforesaid judgment because, in the said case, under similar circumstances, petitioner therein was permitted to move an appropriate application before the learned Trial Court where the marksheet in original stood deposited, and on receipt of such application, the learned Trial Court was to pass appropriate orders. Relevant portion of the said decision read as under:

*“5. In the light of the fact that the relevant correction, if ordered, has to be carried out in the original record, which is presently lying with the learned Trial Court, this Court is of the considered view that it would be in the interest of justice, in case, the petitioner is granted permission to move an application to this effect before the learned Trial Court, which in the light of the contents of the application, may pass appropriate order thereupon.*

*6. Ms. Tanu Sharma, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2, has also apprised the Court that as far as the role of respondent No.2 in this writ petition is concerned, it is very limited. Once the Degree of the petitioner is verified by*

*the University concerned, it is only thereafter that the petitioner can approach respondent No.2 for her registration and the registration will be if the petitioner satisfies the statutory provisions of the Act concerned.*

*7. In the light of the above observations, this writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to move an appropriate application before the learned Trial Court where the mark-sheets in original stand deposited and on the receipt of any such application, let the learned Trial Court pass appropriate order thereupon. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.”*

**5.** Consequently, in view of the above, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the same, reserving liberty to the petitioner to move an appropriate application before the learned trial Court, where the marksheets as well as original degree are lying deposited. Ordered accordingly. In the event of filing such application, learned Trial Court shall pass appropriate orders thereupon. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),  
Judge**

September 10, 2026  
(Sunil)