



**[212] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-29632-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:21.11.2025

GAURAV AND OTHERS

...PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

MAHARSHI DAYANAND UNIVERSITY ROHTAK AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(S)

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

Present: Mr. Birender Singh Rana, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Neeraj Mann, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Amit Rao, Advocate and
Mr. Nikhil Lather, Advocate for respondent No.1-University.

Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate for respondent No.2-College.

Mr. Mohit Vashisth, Advocate for respondent
No.3-Bar Council of India.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)

1. This writ petition has been filed by the students challenging the action of the Bar Council of India in placing the Teerthanker K.R.D. Law College, Jatauly Hailey Mandi, Tehsil Pataudi, District Gurugram, in the '*No Admission Category*'.

2. On the previous occasion, we issued notice in the matter and an affidavit has been filed by the University placing on record the facts to show that the concerned College has forged the documents to obtain approval from the Bar Council of India to run the L.L.B. Course. In its reply, the University has also placed on record two letters allegedly issued by the University dated 16.10.2023 and 12.11.2023, indicating that the University has granted recommendation to the concerned College. The University has subsequently clarified that these letters are forged. It is for this reason that the concerned College itself has been placed in '*No Admission Category*'.



3. Though the respondent No.2-College is represented and the allegations are disputed, but we find *prima facie* existence of material to indicate that the permission to run the L.L.B. Course has been obtained on the strength of manipulated records. It shall, therefore, be open to the University/Bar Council of India to initiate civil and criminal proceedings against the concerned College.

4. So far as the present petitioners are concerned, it shall be open for them to approach the concerned University for being admitted in other Colleges which shall be accorded consideration, depending upon the availability of seats and also subject to the eligibility/merits of the petitioners.

5. The argument that admission was granted to students prior to the decision of placing the institute in 'No Admission Category' and, therefore, petitioners be allowed to continue with the course, cannot be sustained as once it is found that the permission to run the law course itself was based upon a fraudulent document, the College cannot be allowed to run the course. The law is otherwise well settled that fraud vitiates all Solemn Acts.

6. The petitioners will nevertheless be at liberty to institute appropriate proceedings to claim damages against the concerned College.

7. The petition is **disposed of** in the above terms.

8. Pending application(s), if any, is/are disposed of accordingly.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 21, 2025

Anjal

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