

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.8215 OF 2010

Ishan S. Darekar ... Petitioner
v/s
University of Pune and others ... Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.8218 OF 2010

Pravin Abhimanyu Patil ... Petitioner
v/s
University of Pune and others ... Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.9408 OF 2014

Aditya R. Patil ... Petitioner
v/s
v/s
University of Pune and others ... Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.8265 OF 2011

Ishan S. Darekar ... Petitioner
v/s
v/s
University of Pune and others ... Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.8274 OF 2011

Poja Nishikant Shirolkar and others ... Petitioners
v/s

v/s
University of Pune and others ... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.8241 OF 2011**

Tanvi Prakash Athalye and another ... Petitioners
v/s
v/s
University of Pune and others ... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.8267 OF 2011**

Pravin Abhimanyu Patil ... Petitioners v/s
v/s
University of Pune and others ... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.8276 OF 2011**

Viraj Himanshu Talwalkar and others ... Petitioners
v/s
v/s
University of Pune and others ... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.2311 OF 2011**

Ajay Ramesh Choudhary ... Petitioner
v/s
v/s
University of Pune and others ... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.8266 OF 2011**

Vinay Manikrao Ingle and others ... Petitioners

v/s
University of Pune and others

... Respondents

Mr Sugandh B. Deshmukh for Respondent No.2.

Mr A.V. Bukhari, Sr. Advocate with Mr Rahul Nerlekar for Respondent No.3.

**CORAM: MOHIT S. SHAH, C.J. &
B.P. COLABAWALLA, J.**

DATE : 04 SEPTEMBER 2015

P.C.:

The learned senior counsel for Respondent No.3 – Council of Architecture has taken out this praecipe dated 4th September 2015 for speaking to the of our order dated 1st April 2015.

The learned senior counsel for the Council of Architecture submits that it was only the contention of the Council of Architecture that the Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations 2008 were required to be approved by the Government of India or that the matter was required to be decided on the basis of the Regulations of 1983. It is submitted that it is the contention of the Council of Architecture that 2008 Regulations are not Regulations but they are minimum standards of architectural education prescribed by the Council of Architecture under section 21 of the Council of Architecture Act 1972.

The learned counsel for Respondent No.2 – College does not agreed with the above submission.

It is not necessary to decide the above controversy because for the purposes of deciding the controversy which was the subject matter of Writ Petitions, there is no material change in the Regulations to the effect that first the academic years / six semesters of approximately 16 working weeks each of the course shall be a basic standard course and shall be the first stage, provided that candidates admitted to the course shall complete the first state within five years of admission to the course.

We further direct that in paragraph 1 of the order dated 1st April 2015 the appearance shall be shown as under :-

“In place of the words – 'Advocate for Council of Architecture', the words – 'Advocate for Respondent No.2 – College' shall be substituted.”

It is clarified that the order dated 1st April 2015 does not preclude the Council of Architecture from contending in other proceedings that the Minimum Standards of Architectural Education 2008 are valid and operative.

CHIEF JUSTICE

B.P. COLABAWALLA, J.