



CM-10528-CWP-2025 in/and CWP-20775-2025 (O&M)

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CM-10528-CWP-2025 in/and CWP-20775-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 28.07.2025

Vaibhav Joshi

.....Petitioner

Versus

Joint Admission Committee and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present: Ms. Harshika Verma, Advocate (arguing counsel),
Mr. Vibhu Agnihotri, Advocate, and
Mr. Pushap Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sukhmani Patwalia, Advocate (arguing counsel),
Mr. Varun Sandhu, Advocate,
for respondents No.1, 3 and 4.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

1. While hearing arguments on application (CM-10528-CWP-2025) filed by respondents No.1, 3 and 4 seeking re-calling of interim order dated 23.07.2025 passed by this Court, with the consent of learned counsel for the parties, main case (listed for 06.08.2025) is taken up today for hearing.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, Ms. Harshika Verma, does not dispute that pursuant to interim order dated 23.07.2025, the petitioner has been considered and allotted a seat in four years Bachelor of Architecture course in Chandigarh College of Architecture, Chandigarh. It is informed that the petitioner has also deposited the fee on 26.07.2025.



3. Since some of the candidates, who had been admitted during the first round of counselling, had secured lower merit ranking in JEE (Main) – 2025 than the petitioner and denial of admission was for reasons beyond the control of petitioner, this Court directs that the said admission and allotment of seat to the petitioner should be regularised.

4. At this juncture, learned counsel for respondents No.1, 3 and 4 contends that notice should be issued to the Punjab State Board of Technical Education and Industrial Training (respondent No.2 herein) to find out as to whether the delayed declaration of result of the qualifying examination, i.e. Diploma in Architecture, was for reasons attributed to the petitioner or not.

4.1 Respondents No.1, 3 and 4 are suggested/advised to get their house in order, rather than blaming others, by carrying out suitable amendments in the relevant Rules, if so advised.

5. With the aforesaid observations, the petition stands disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

July 28, 2025
narotam

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No