

**THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No. 24469 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: January 14, 2015

Monika Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. **Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?**
2. **To be referred to the Reporters or not ?**
3. **Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?**

Present: Mr. Puneet Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amarjit Singh Virk, Advocate,
for the respondents.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

CM No. 402 of 2015

CM is allowed. Written statement is taken on record.

Main case

1. Learned counsel for the respondent states that he has deposited the costs, as directed by this court on 6.1.2015.
2. The petitioner's request for extension of time for submission of Ph.D thesis, which period had expired on 15.6.2014, was rejected by the Vice Chancellor through order dated 29.10.2014. The petitioner had registered for Ph.D on 16.6.2008 and as per the rules, the thesis was to be submitted within four years which could be extended by further period of

two years. The request came through an undated application and recommendation through the guide by endorsement on 16.6.2014. The petitioner would refer to her own illness and the fact of death of her father as justifying circumstances to seek for such extension. In the writ petition, the petitioner would refer to the decisions of the Academic Council which had extended the period for nearly 20 candidates and the petitioner's attempt was to show that even beyond six years period, the Academic Council had made further extension. According to the petitioner, the same benefit must be also given to the petitioner. The counsel would urge that the thesis are ready and she can submit the same subject to any fee that may be required to be paid.

3. The counsel appearing for the University points out that the letter for extension must be given before the last date which fell on 15.6.2014 and her own letter of request was deliberately undated only because she was aware that she has failed to seek for extension before the last date. I notice that the endorsement of recommendation is made on 16.6.2014. The last date 15.6.2014 was a Sunday and 16.6.2014 must be taken to be the last date. There is therefore, no delay.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents points out that even the reasons given for extension are not adequate. The medical certificate which was submitted later was also undated and it makes merely a reference to an episode seizure in January, 2013. I cannot really find this to be a valid justification for extension and there was no illness immediately prior to June, 2014. Yet another ground which is taken is that her father died and the petitioner being the eldest child in the family she has to

manage the family affairs. The counsel for the respondents points out that the father died in the year 2012 and this was taken to be the reason for extension even for the previous year and the very same reason cannot prevail. I find the reasons given to be frail but it is all a matter of how a person copes with a major bereavement in the family. What could pass off as normal after 6 months or one year may not cause such relief to yet another person. It is possible that the petitioner was overwhelmed for grief for beyond a year as well. An adult ought to know to cope with normal life and death situation. Though I am not impressed with the reasons given, there was surely extension given by the university in the past even upto 9 years. The counsel for the respondents points out that there were 2 other candidates along with the petitioner who did not apply for extension before the last date and their case had already been rejected and not placed before the Academic Council. I have already observed that there was no delay, I will, therefore, hold that the decision not to permit the petitioner to submit the thesis is not an irreversible one. Considering the fact that the petitioner claims that she has thesis ready, I will allow the benefit of submission of the thesis within one week and the petitioner shall also pay Rs. 50,000/- as condition for acceptance of the thesis as fine for late submission without adequate reasons. The payment shall be made along with submission of the thesis to the concerned department. The department shall receive the thesis if the petitioner produces a proof of payment of Rs. 50,000/- for the delayed application for extension of time to the university and the department will put it up in accordance with the regulations for due consideration of her thesis.

5. The order is quashed and the writ petition is disposed of on the above terms. The case is decided on the peculiar facts of the case and will not operate as precedent for extension of time for submission of thesis.

January 14, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE