



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

\*\*\*\*

**CWP-25094-2025**

**Date of Decision: 27.08.2025**

LOVEJEET SINGH

...PETITIONER

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR

...RESPONDENTS

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

Present:- Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate and  
Mr. Sameer Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Maninder Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. Gursher Bhandal, Advocate  
for the respondent(s)-University.

\*\*\*\*

**ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)**

1. Mr. Gursher Bhandal, learned counsel enters appearance on behalf of the respondent No.2-University on advance notice.

2. This petition has been filed with a prayer to command the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for admission in General Category as a Punjab resident in B.V. Science & A.H. Course for which the counselling is under process.

3. It is contended that the petitioner has studied throughout in the State of Punjab and therefore by virtue of classification contained in the Prospectus, he is entitled to be treated as a candidate from the State of Punjab.

4. The petition is opposed by the learned counsel for the

respondent-University who points out that in the application form of the petitioner, he has clearly claimed himself to be a resident of State of Haryana. He has also stated that he is not a resident of State of Punjab.

5. Our attention has been invited to the application form of the petitioner at page No.162 of the paper book wherein the two relevant Clauses reads as under:-

|                                     |                 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <i>“Are you a resident of</i>       |                 |
| <i>Punjab or Chandigarh (U.T.)?</i> | <i>NO</i>       |
| <i>State</i>                        | <i>Haryana”</i> |

6. The question as to whether the petitioner can be treated to be a candidate hailing from the State of Punjab could have been considered in terms of the Prospectus if the petitioner had asserted himself to be a resident of Punjab. This however is not the position in the instant case. The petitioner not only has claimed himself to be from the State of Haryana but in a pointed question as to whether he is a resident of Punjab or Chandigarh, the petitioner has stated ‘No’. Even, in the Admit Card issued to the petitioner, the petitioner has claimed himself to be a resident of State of Haryana. The National Eligibility-cum-Entrance Test (UG) Admit Card also shows the eligibility of the petitioner from the State of Haryana. Once the petitioner has throughout claimed himself to be a resident of State of Haryana, he cannot be permitted now to assert that he ought to be treated as a candidate of State of Punjab. The petitioner cannot be permitted to blow hot and cold together.

7. The question as to who all can be considered from the State

of Punjab would have no applicability once the petitioner himself has not claimed himself to be a candidate from the State of Punjab.

8. So far as the judgment passed by this Court in Vasu Sirohi v. State of Punjab and others, **CWP-29483-2022** relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner is concerned, the judgment is clearly distinguishable inasmuch as the petitioners in that case had claimed their admission in Punjab quota and they were non-suited only because their address was of some other place. This judgment on facts has no applicability to the facts of the instant case.

9. In that view of the matter, the instant writ petition is **dismissed**. Pending application(s), if any also stand(s) disposed of.

**[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]  
JUDGE**

**[ROHIT KAPOOR]  
JUDGE**

**AUGUST 27, 2025**

*Rahul Joshi*

- |    |                           |        |
|----|---------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether Speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |