

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO. 3013/2018.

Pratik Pramodrao Dhakade.

-VERSUS-

Centralized Counselling for M.Tech, Admission and others.

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders

CORAM : B.P. DHARMADHIKARI
& M. G. GIRATKAR, JJ.

DATE : OCTOBER 03, 2018.

Heard Shri S.O. Ahmed, learned Counsel for the petitioner, Shri N. Verma, learned Counsel for respondent no.1, Shri A.M. Kadukar, learned A.G.P. for respondent no.2, Shri A. Parchure, learned Counsel for respondent no.3, Shri A.R. Patil, learned Counsel for respondent no.6, Shri S.S. Ghate, learned Counsel for respondent no.7 and Shri N.P. Lambat, learned Counsel for respondent no.8.

2. Learned Counsel for respondent no.6 University has pointed out that when petitioner passed out Degree was very much known as "Degree in B.Sc.

2

(Agri. Bio. Technology).” In subsequent years, the name was changed as “B.Tech (Bio.Technology)”.

3. These facts are not in dispute.

4. Respondents submit that thus, petitioner has not approached this Court with clean hands.

5. Learned counsel for petitioner is relying upon a Division Bench judgment and order dated 24.11.2016 in Writ Petition No. 5283/2016. He points out that there are similar controversy in relation to “Food Science and Food Technology”, has been looked into.

6. We have perused that judgment. Paragraph no.7, clearly shows a finding which reveals that the petitioner – Ms. Neelam, in that matter, was not contending that her degree in Food Science was equivalent to Degree in Food Technology. Here petitioner in order to qualify for admission in respondent no.4 Institute, is claiming such equivalence and submits that changed name B.Tech, enables and qualifies petitioner for further admission.

7. At this stage, our attention is invited to a admission given to a colleague of petitioner by IIT Gauhati. We find that attention of IIT may not have

3

been invited to this aspect of the matter. Without establishing equivalence of two courses, petitioner cannot ask respondent no.4 to admit him. Respondent no.4 has come up with a case that course contents are different and degree secured by the petitioner does not entitle him to admission to M.Tech (Bio. Technology) with it.

8. Other respondents are also not controverting this stand of respondent no.4.

9. We therefore find that it is an act by some authority in changing the name of the degree, that has led to this confusion. Hence, with liberty to petitioner to take appropriate action against that Authority for such renaming of a Degree course, we dismiss the Writ Petition. No costs.

10. Needless to mention that interim order operating in the matter, stands vacated.

JUDGE**JUDGE**

Rgd.