



211  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-7479-2018(O&M)  
Date of decision: 02.08.2024

**Valuers Association and others**

**...Petitioners**

**VERSUS**

**University Grants Commission and others**

**...Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present:- Mr. H.C. Arora, Advocate and  
Ms. Sunaina, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Salil Sabhlok, Advocate,  
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Karan Bhardwaj, Advocate, for  
Mr. Padamkant Dwivedi, Advocate,  
for respondent No.3.

Mr. Vishal Aggarwal, Advocate,  
for respondent No.4.

\*\*\*\*

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)**

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the University Grants Commission (UGC)/respondent No.1 for restraining respondents No.2 to 4 from continuing with Post Graduation courses of 'M.Sc. in Real Estate' or 'M.Com. in Real Estate' etc. which are being conducted by the aforesaid respondents in an illegal manner and in violation of the various notifications issued by the University Grants



Commission and without seeking any permission from the All India Council for Technical Education.

2. Respondent No.1 is the University Grants Commission, whereas respondents No.2 and 3 are the Universities outside the State of Punjab and Haryana. Respondent No.2 is the University situated in Tamil Nadu and respondent No.3 is the University situated in Maharashtra. Respondent No.4 is one Institute situated in Gujarat. The prayer of the petitioners in the present case is for seeking a direction against the UGC for restraining respondents No.2 to 4 not to conduct the Post Graduation courses of 'M.Sc. in Real Estate' or 'M.Com. in Real Estate' etc.

3. Today, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.1 has categorically submitted that so far as respondent No.3-Shivaji University is concerned, the UGC has enquired into the matter and he has instructions to state that they are not conducting the aforesaid courses. He further submitted that so far as respondent No.2-Annamalai University is concerned, they have been restrained by the UGC for conducting the aforesaid courses but as per their instructions, an interim order has been passed by the Madras High Court in this regard. He while referring to the affidavit filed submitted that respondent No.4 is not recognized Institute by UGC-DEB/erstwhile DEC to offer any programme through distance mode.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the University Grants Commission be directed to take action against respondent No.4 if it is not a recognized Institute to which learned counsel for respondent No.1 has stated that the UGC does not have any power to take an action against a private Institute.



5. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the statement made by learned counsel for respondent No.1, the present petition is disposed of. Liberty is granted to the petitioners to make any application/complaint/representation to the Government of India, Ministry of Education or any other relevant authority seeking redressal of their grievance against respondent No.4, if any, in accordance with law.

02.08.2024

rakesh

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether reportable

:

Yes/No