



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

CWP-29870-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:14.11.2025

VAIBHAV SOOD

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA AND ANOTHER

....RESPONDENT(S)

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

Present: Mrs. Ritam Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Promila Nain, Senior Panel Counsel with
Mr. Ish Karan Singh, Central Govt. Counsel
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Hemen Aggarwal, Advocate
for the respondent(s)-UGC.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner is aggrieved by the Equivalence Certificate granted by the University Grants Commission (for short, 'UGC') to a three-year Degree Course which he has pursued from a University in Quebec, Canada.

2. According to the petitioner, the course completed by him in Canada is equivalent to a three-year Degree course in India but the authorities have taken a different opinion.

3. *Vide* Order dated 07.11.2025, we granted time to the learned counsel for the respondent(s)-UGC to obtain instructions in the matter. As per the instructions of UGC, the Course content is such that the

petitioner's course qualifies for a grant of 4.5 score which is not equivalent to a three-year Degree course in India.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the authorities have not examined the Course content in the correct perspective and in the event petitioner is given an opportunity, he would be able to successfully explain the expert body that the course undertaken by him is actually equivalent to a three-year Degree course in India.

5. We are also informed by the learned counsel representing the respondent(s)-UOI that the review application is also pending.

6. Although learned counsel for the respondent(s)-UGC contends that the review application would not be maintainable, considering the facts and circumstances brought on record, we are of the view that the petitioner should be granted an opportunity to place the complete material on the basis of which the expert body may be well advised to take a fresh decision.

7. In that view of the matter, without entering into the merits of the claim put forth by the petitioner, we dispose of this petition with liberty reserved to the petitioner to submit all materials in support of his claim together with a copy of this order to the second respondent-UGC within 10 days.

8. We also request the respondent-UGC to place all such material before the competent authority who may look into the matter independently and take an appropriate decision within a period of four weeks thereafter. The decision taken, pursuant to the orders of this Court, shall abide by the previous determination in respect of the cause which is

under challenge in this petition.

9. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 14, 2025
Rahul Joshi

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