

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Date of decision:- 29.09.2020

1. CWP No. 15572 of 2020

Chiraag Malli		Petitioner
	Versus	
Panjab University and others		...Respondents

2. CWP No. 15618 of 2020

Subhash Rao and others		Petitioners
	Versus	
Panjab University and others		...Respondents

3. CWP No. 15682 of 2020

Rosen and another		Petitioners
	Versus	
Panjab University and others		...Respondents

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE**
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE.

Present:- Mr. Abhinav Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioner in
 CWP No. 15572 of 2020.
 Mr. Deepak Vashishth, Advocate, for the petitioners in
 CWP No. 15618 of 2020.
 Mr. Sandeep Verma, Advocate, for the petitioners in
 CWP No. 15682 of 2020.
 Mr. Subhash Ahuja, Advocate, for the respondent-University.

* * * *

RAVI SHANKER JHA, C.J. (ORAL)

With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the matter is being taken up and heard via video conferencing.

These petitions have been filed seeking quashing of the proceedings of the Committee dated 09.09.2020 in relation to the conduct of under graduate law entrance test for making admissions to the law courses by Panjab University, Chandigarh.

It is pertinent to note that previously a Division Bench of this Court by its order dated 01.09.2020 passed in Civil Writ Petition No. 12832 of 2020 ***Saurav Rao and others v. Panjab University through its Registrar and others***, upon consideration of the decision of the University to scrap the U.G. LAW entrance exam for the 5 years Law Course, and instead make admissions on the basis of 10+2 marks, directed the University to

re-consider its decision in the light of the issues raised in the petitions as also the observations made by the Division Bench.

In compliance to the order dated 01.09.2020 (ibid), the matter was considered by the specially constituted Committee by the Vice Chancellor and it was resolved, vide a decision dated 09.09.2020 (Annexure P5), to scrap the entrance examination for 5 years integrated course as also the 3 years Law Course for the session 2020-21.

When this matter came up before a coordinate Bench yesterday, the Court purport to had observed that impugned decision by the University was taken without considering the observations recorded by the Division Bench in *Saurav Rao and others case (supra)*. Accordingly, learned counsel for the University had prayed for and was granted time to seek instructions.

And today, learned counsel for the University submits that although the Bar Council Regulations and Resolutions do not prescribe or mandate that all admissions to the law courses should be made only through the entrance examination, which position of law is not even disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioners, however, he informs the Court that as far as the present examination is concerned, the University has decided to re-consider the impugned decision dated 09.09.2020. He has produced a formal communication dated 28.09.2020 in this regard, which is taken on record as **Mark 'A'**. He further submits that a fresh decision in relation to the matter in issue will be taken within three days and shall be posted on the website of the University.

In the wake of the statement of the learned counsel for the University and a copy of the decision dated 28.09.2020 (Mark 'A'), we do not propose to go into the merits of the petition or the issues raised therein, for, the University itself has resolved to re-consider its recommendations dated 09.09.2020 and take decision afresh.

With the aforesaid observations and the statement made by learned counsel for the University, all the petitions stand disposed of.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

29.09.2020

ravinder