

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 2166 of 2018**

- Chuneswar Singh Rajput S/o Shri Roopsingh Rajput Aged About 32 Years R/o Kalika Nagar Tifra, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. The Secretary, Bar Council Of India, 21, Rouse Avenue Institutional Area, Near Bal Bhawan, New Delhi – 110 002
2. The Secretary Bar Council Of Chhattisgarh, New High Court Premises Above Advocates Room, Bodri, Bilaspur - 495001 Chhattisgarh.
3. University Grants Commission Through Its Secretary, University Grants Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi - 110002
4. The Vice Chancellor Bilaspur University, Near Gandhi Chowk, Old High Court Building, Bilaspur - 495001 Chhattisgarh.
5. The Principal D.P. Vipra Law College, Ashok Nagar, Seepat Road Bilaspur – 495001 Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Petitioner : Shri Atanu Ghosh, Advocate.
For Respondent No.3 : Shri Sachin Singh Rajput, Advocate.
For Respondents 4 & 5 : Shri Sudeep Agrawal, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****19/09/2018 :**

1. The petitioner has been denied admission in the first year LLB Course by respondent No.5 College on the ground that the petitioner has failed to secure minimum qualifying marks i.e. 42% as OBC candidate in the qualifying graduation examination.

2. Admittedly, the petitioner has secured less than 42% marks in the graduation i.e. BA examination, therefore, he is not eligible for admission in the LLB Course, but the petitioner has placed reliance on circular issued by the Bar Council of India recognizing several other examinations of different universities as equivalent to the graduation examination treating the same to be qualifying examination for the LLB Course.
3. Case of the petitioner is not that he has passed some other examination which should be equated with the graduation examination. He has in-fact passed graduation examination but has failed to secure minimum qualifying marks. Resolution of the Bar Council filed along with rejoinder would not come to the petitioner's rescue in improving his eligibility to bring him within the zone of consideration.
4. For the foregoing, the Writ Petition has no substance, the same deserves to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-
Judge
(Prashant Kumar Mishra)

Barve