

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**

**ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 1530 OF 2019**

|                             |     |                    |
|-----------------------------|-----|--------------------|
| Joshi Riya Tribhuvan        | ... | <b>Petitioner</b>  |
| Versus                      |     |                    |
| University Of Mumbai & Ors. | ... | <b>Respondents</b> |

Adv. Yogesh Joshi i/b. YRJ Legal, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Adv. Sudhesh Kumar Naidu a/w. Adv. Divya Yajurvedi i/b. C.R. Naidu & Co., Advocate for the Respondent Nos.3 to 5.

**CORAM: S.V. GANGAPURWALA &  
R. N. LADDHA, JJ.**

**DATED : OCTOBER 11, 2022**

**P.C.**

1. We have heard learned Advocate for the petitioner. The learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was wrongly detained for one year on the ground of low attendance. The attendance has not been properly calculated by the college. 25 days of the petitioner are not calculated. If the same are calculated, the petitioner could have been entitled to appear for two subjects. The learned Counsel submits that the University Authority also did not give proper opportunity to petitioner to put forth her case. If all the attendance are perused, the petitioner would complete the qualifying attendance. The learned Counsel submits that on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019, the petitioner had also given application to the College, however, the college did not

consider the same. The learned Counsel submits that University ought to have considered the case of the petitioner on merit. The petitioner has not claimed any further relief against the College, but only that stigma of low attendance is required to be removed.

2. We have heard learned Counsel for the respondents.

3. The matter pertains to academic year 2019-20. The petitioner has subsequently appeared for further examination. Today, the matter is merely academic. Even if we come to the conclusion that the petitioner had the minimum attendance, no purpose would be served. The petitioner has not claimed any further relief except challenging the order dated 12<sup>th</sup> April 2019 detaining the petitioner for one year on account of low attendance.

4. As the matter is now only academic, we do not intend to consider the same on merits.

5. The writ petition, as such, is disposed of. No costs.

(R. N. LADDHA, J.)

(S.V. GANGAPURWALA, J.)

RAJU  
DATTATRAYA  
GAIKWAD  
Digitally signed  
by RAJU  
DATTATRAYA  
GAIKWAD  
Date:  
2022.10.13  
11:50:27 +0530