



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

29 CONT. PETITION NO. 610 OF 2025

Rohini D/o. Bharatban Goswami
VERSUS
Shri Dr. Harshadeep Kamble And Others

- ...
- Adv. Amarsinha Dharmaraj Sonkawade, Advocate for the Petitioner
 - Mr. A. R. Kale, AGP for State
 - Adv. Vinod B. Jadhav, Advocate for Respondent No. 4
- ...

**CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI AND
VAISHALI PATIL-JADHAV, JJ.**

DATE : 15.12.2025

PER COURT:

1. It is the case of the petitioner that she was admitted at college level by taking into consideration the marks secured by her in the CET held by the Association of Private Medical Colleges (NEET-UGC 2013 Examination). The respondents have denied reimbursement of the petitioner's fees in spite of directions given by this Court, by relying on the Supreme Court's order which is as follows:

"The schemes for reimbursement of fee formulated by the State of Maharashtra by the Academic Years 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 have been upheld by the High Court. Students who have been admitted by the institution(s) are not entitled to claim reimbursement of fee. Only those students who have been admitted after participating in the counseling in the Common Entrance Test are eligible for claiming reimbursement."

2. The petitioner contends that since she was admitted after taking into consideration marks secured by her in the CET held by the Association of Private Medical Colleges, she is covered by the Government Resolution dated 04.03.2014, particularly clause 'a' of the said resolution, wherein it is mentioned that the students who have secured admissions for first-year medical courses such as BDS, Homeopathy, Unani, Ayurveda, Physiotherapy, Occupational Therapy and Nursing, on the basis of the admission process initiated by Association of Management of Unaided Private Medical and Dental Colleges of Maharashtra, Mumbai, shall be entitled for reimbursement of their fees.

3. Learned AGP then points out Government Resolution of reimbursement of fees dated 30.03.2013, which specifically states that after completion of the admission process, students who were admitted at college level on the vacant seats will not be entitled to claim benefit of this.

It is necessary to mention here that the said reliance is misplaced and misconceived in view of the fact that in the said Government Resolution it is categorically mentioned that the said Government Resolution would be applicable for the admissions taken in the Academic Year 2014-2015.

4. Petitioner has also sought to place reliance on the orders passed by this Court in similar circumstances in WP No. 8435/2017 and

connected matters, wherein a direction was given to the respondents not to demand tuition fees from the petitioner therein, and it is further held that it will be the responsibility of the State Government to reimburse the tuition fees of the petitioner in terms of policy decision under Government Resolution dated 04.03.2014, if the conditions of Government Resolution are fulfilled.

5. Learned advocate appearing for the respondent - College states that these orders are passed in the cases of the students who were from the same batch and the same college like that of the petitioner.

6. In the present case, we are of the view that the petitioner is fulfilling the conditions. Hence, the respondents are directed to consider the case of the petitioner and grant her reimbursement of fees within a period of eight weeks from today, failing which the contempt action will be initiated against the respondents.

7. With the above direction, contempt petition stands disposed of.

8. Needless to state that if the time stipulation is not followed, the same will be treated as aggravated form of contempt.

[VAISHALI PATIL-JADHAV, J.]

[NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.]