



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/3607/2025</u> Uttaranchal Ayurvedic College --Petitioner Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.</u> Mr. Navneet Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner. 2. Mr. Devendra Pant, Standing Counsel for the State of Uttarakhand/ respondent no. 1. 3. Mr. Sandeep Kothari, Advocate for respondent no. 2. 4. This writ petition is filed by Uttaranchal Ayurvedic College, Dehradun seeking the following reliefs:- "I. Issue appropriate writ, order, or direction in the nature of certiorari for quashing of the impugned orders dated 18.11.2025 (Annexure No. 16) and 19.06.2025 (Annexure No. 13) passed by Respondent No. 2 by which petitioner has been directed to deposit fees in lieu of processing fees, affiliation fees, and security deposit otherwise the same will be recovered as arrears of land revenue. II. Issue a Writ, order, or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the Respondent No. 2 not to take any coercive measure (in the form of stopping the petitioner for participating in counselling for BAMS/PG Courses/ BNYS Courses and further to continue granting affiliation to the petitioner as per the fee fixed) against the petitioner in lieu of pending processing fees for affiliation, affiliation fees, and security deposit.



		5. The impugned orders are on record as Annexure-13 & 16 to the writ petition. By the order dated 19.06.2025, petitioner was asked to deposit ₹24,50,000/- towards processing fee, affiliation fee and security deposit, failing which the said amount would be recovered as arrears of land revenue. By the subsequent letter dated 18.11.2025, impugned herein, the Director of the petitioner-college was informed that if the cheque amounting to ₹24,50,000/- submitted by the petitioner-college is dishonoured, then the amount of cheque shall also be liable to be recovered as arrears of land revenue. 6. Learned counsel for the University contends that the writ petition is premature, as no recovery has been made from the petitioner as yet and petitioner has simply been told that in case he fails to deposit the amount, mentioned in the order dated 19.06.2025, then he will have to face recovery proceedings. He submits that if petitioner has any grievance in respect of the demand made by the University, then petitioner is free to approach the competent authority in the University by making a representation. He submits that petitioner has made representation to the competent authority and the writ petition can be disposed of by directing the competent authority to take decision in the matter. 7. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that petitioner be
--	--	--



			permitted to make fresh representation. 8. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of by permitting petitioner to make fresh representation. If he makes such representation within two weeks, the Registrar of the concerned University shall take decision on the representation, as per law, within four weeks. For a period of six weeks or till decision is taken on the representation, whichever is earlier, no coercive action shall be taken against the petitioner for recovery of amount indicated in the impugned orders. (Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.) 30.06.2026 Navin NAVEEN CHANDRA
--	--	--	--