

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

**CWP No.16608 of 2016
Decided on :18.11.2016**

Sukrant Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

The Registrar, Kurukshetra University and another

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA

Present : Mr. Bhagwat Dayal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Virk, Advocate for the respondents.

G.S. Sandhawal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner seeks direction for admission in the 3 years Law Course with the respondent-University. Though he had figured at Sr. No.61 in the merit list (Annexure P-4), he has been denied admission on the ground that the formal degree has not been issued. Thereafter, representation had also been made on 28.07.2016 (Annexure P-5) and then this Court had been approached on the ground that there are vacant seats available.

In the response filed by the respondent-University, it has been submitted that the eligibility of the petitioner had been put before the Admission Committee. In the absence of the B.A. 3rd Year mark-sheet, the eligibility was not confirmed and the petitioner was not admitted, as per the report dated 21.07.2016 (Annexure R1/1). The second counselling was held on 28.07.2016, but there was no vacant seats at that point of time. One was wrongly shown vacant, as admission of the one candidate had been revived. The other seat had been kept reserved in terms of pendency of ***CWP No.14774 of 2016 'Sanjiv Kumar Vs. Kurukshetra University and***

another'. Resultantly, admission could not be given to the petitioner.

On the last date of hearing, counsel for the respondent-University had taken time to find out whether there is any vacant seat available or not, as the petitioner had in the meantime got DMC from the Kalinga University, Chhatisgarh.

Counsel for the respondent-University submits that there are vacant seats, but at this stage, it is not possible to grant admission to the petitioner, as the cut-off-date was 01.08.2016, and the exams are slated for 08.12.2016.

Keeping in view the above, this Court is of the opinion that there is no fault as such on the part of the respondent-University, which would warrant interference by this Court. The process of the admission is a time-bound procedure and a tight schedule has to be maintained. The lapse if any, is on the part of the University, in which he was earlier studying, for the delay in the issuance of the DMC and not on the part of the respondent-University.

In such circumstances, the denial of admission on account complete documents not being there at the time of counselling cannot be held to be an arbitrary action as such. Resultantly, no relief can be granted to the petitioner and the writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

NOVEMBER 18, 2016
Naveen

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes
No