



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>WPMS/2522/2026</u> Deepak Chandra Upreti --Petitioner Versus Soban Singh Jeena University Almora and others --Respondents <u>Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.</u> Dr. Kartikey Hari Gupta and Mr. Rafat Munir Ali, Advocates for the petitioner. 2. Mr. C.S. Rawat, Advocate for respondent nos. 1 & 2. 3. Mr. Suyash Pant, Standing Counsel and Mr. C.S. Joshi, Brief Holder for the State/respondent no. 3. 4. Mr. Anjali Bhargava, Advocate for respondent no. 4. 5. Petitioner participated in an entrance test for admission to Ph.D. Programme, in S.S.J. University, Almora. Since he was declared unsuccessful, therefore, he has approached this Court seeking the following reliefs:-



			<i>“i. A Writ Order or Direction in the nature of Certiorari calling for records and quash the Ph.D. Entrance Exam, 2026 Result (Annexure No. 6 at Pg. No. 81-88) to the extent of the petitioner (Roll No. 2613216 - Deepak Upreti, Subject Name & Code - 13 History).</i> <i>ii. A Writ Order or Direction in the nature of Mandamus, directing the respondents to reconduct the Ph.D. Entrance Exam 2025 2026 for Subject & Code 13 History for remaining vacant 20 seats, strictly in accordance with Regulation 5 (2) (ii) & other provisions of the U.G.C. Regulations, 2022 (Annexure No. 3 at Pg. No. 16-28) by giving Entrance Test Syllabus consisting 50% questions of Research Methodology and 50% of Subject - History.”</i> 6. Learned counsel for petitioner relies upon Clause 5 (2) (ii) of University Grants Commission (Minimum Standards and Procedures for Award of Ph.D. Degree) Regulations, 2022, which reads as under:- <i>“5(2) ii. HEIs may admit students through an Entrance Test conducted at the level of the individual HEI. The Entrance Test syllabus shall consist of 50% of research methodology, and 50% shall be subject-specific.”</i> 7. It is contended that in the question paper, which Ph.D. aspirants had to answer, there were more than 50% questions taken from history and there was no question from research methodology. Thus, it is contrary to provision contained in Rule 5 (2) (ii). 8. Learned State Counsel, however, submits that what Rule 5 (2) (ii)
--	--	--	---



			provides is that the syllabus of question paper shall be so devised so that out of total questions, 50% should be from research methodology and the remaining would be subject specific. 9. Law is well settled that in academic matters, in the absence of expertise, constitutional Courts should not exercise power of judicial review in these matters. Which question is from research methodology or which question is asked from syllabus can only be decided and discerned by the subject experts. The fact remains that petitioner could not succeed in the entrance test, therefore, he is before this Court. 10. This Court do not find any scope for interference in the matter. The writ petition fails and is dismissed. (Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.) 19.08.2026
--	--	--	--

Navin
NAVEEN
CHANDRA

