



102+204 (3 cases)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

1. CWP-18872-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 1st September, 2025

MANU GARGPetitioner(s)
V/s.
STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERSRespondent(s)

2. CWP-22046-2019 (O&M)

SAAKHI KAUR AHUJA AND OTHERSPetitioner(s)
V/s.
STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERSRespondent(s)

3. CWP-25687-2019 (O&M)

AKSHIT SHARMAPetitioner(s)
V/s.
STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERSRespondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR

Present Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CWP-18872-2019.

Mr. D.S. Patwalia, Senior Advocate, assisted by
Mr. Gaurav Rana, Advocate, and
Mr. Ayush Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) in CWP-22046-2019.

Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate, and
Mr. Chirag Suri, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CWP-25687-2019.

Mr. Vipin Pal Yadav, Addl. AG, Punjab.
Mr. Nitin Kaushal, Advocate, for respondent No. 3.

Mr. Ravi Sharma, Standing Counsel with
Mr. Rajwant Kaushik, Advocate,
for respondent-National Medical Commission.

Mr. Naresh Prabhakar, Advocate,
for respondents No. 44 and 52 in CWP-18872-2019.

Mr. Sushant Kareer, Advocate,
for respondents No. 27, 112, 116, 117 in CWP-22046-2019.

Mr. Deepum Raghav, Advocate,
for respondents No. 113 in CWP-18872-2019.
for respondent No. 137 in CWP-22046 & 25687-2019.

Mr. Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate,
for respondents No. 61, 74, 99, 109, 117 in CWP-18872-2019.
for respondents No. 124, 133, 141 in CWP-22046-2019.
for respondents No. 123, 124, 133 & 141 in CWP-25687-2019.

Mr. B.S. Rana, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Nayandeep Rana, Advocate,
Mr. Neeraj Madan, Advocate,
for respondents No. 28, 40, 51, 60 & 69 in CWP No. 18872-2019
for respondents No. 24, 52, 66, 79 and 87
in CWPs No. 22046 and 25687-2019.

Mr. Ramandeep Singh Pandher, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

CM-9834-CWP-2025 and CM-12738-CWP-2025 in CWP-18872-2019

Applications are allowed and the affidavits of the petitioner are taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

MAIN CASES

1. This bunch of Writ Petitions essentially challenged the criteria fixed for admission to the Government and Private Medical/Dental Institutes in academic session 2019-2020.

2. The ground of challenge in these Writ Petitions essentially is that the private respondents have secured admission in the Government Colleges on the strength of furnishing wrong affidavits of the declarations. The admissions instructions contemplated an affidavit to be obtained from the student with regard to their residence in the following terms:-

“2. That my child/ward has not obtained benefit of Residence for admission in MBBS/BDS Courses in any other State/UT except central counselling my MCC/DGHS.

3. That my child/ward has applied/has not applied (whichever is applicable) elsewhere in any other State/UT for

admission to MBBS/BDS Courses, Session 2019 in State Quota Counselling.”

3. The Private respondents although had submitted their respective affidavits in the aforesaid format, but it is undisputed that these persons allegedly applied for admission in other States also. In the subsequent enquiry etc., it has come on record that the allegation made by the petitioners that declarations of the private respondents were not correctly made with regard to place of residence, has been found to be correct.

4. Be that as it may, it remains undisputed that all the private respondents have not only been admitted, but they have also passed out from their courses. Similar is the situation with regard to the petitioners, who have also been admitted to various Colleges and have passed out.

5. In such view of the matter, we find that the grievance raised in the present bunch of Writ Petitions has substantially outlived its purpose. Accordingly, all three Writ Petitions stand **disposed of**.

6. All pending applications, if any, in these cases are disposed of accordingly.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

September 1, 2025
Ess Kay

<i>Whether speaking / reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>