



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

CWP-30533-2025

Date of Decision:11.11.2025

SHIKHAR SINGLA

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(S)

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

Present: Mr. R. S. Khosla, Senior Advocate assisted by
Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Chirag Suri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Maninder Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab assisted by
Ms. Samdisha Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nitin Kaushal, Advocate
for the respondent-University.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition is by the candidate who is seeking admission on the basis of his National Eligibility-cum-Entrance Test (*NEET*) score in MBBS in the terrorist affected category. It is not in issue that 1% reservation is provided by the State of Punjab to such candidates.

2. According to the petitioner, the allocation of seat is not done in accordance with merit (college wise) and the *ad hoc* manner, in which reservation is being applied, is frustrating the very object of providing adequate reservation for the concerned category.

3. Reply has been filed on behalf of the respondents placing on record a Resolution of the year 2017, as per which a roster system is to be followed for allocation of seat for different categories including '*terrorist affected category*'. The affidavit further clarifies that in all 689 seats in

different Government Medical Colleges are available in MBBS Course in Punjab and 1% reservation would result in 7 seats falling in '*terrorist affected category*'. In paragraph No.13 of the affidavit, the respondents have specified the allocation of those 7 seats in terrorist affected category which have all gone to different candidates who have secured higher marks than the petitioner in merit. Paragraph No.15 of the affidavit further clarifies that the rank of the petitioner is 2906 whereas the last person who has been allocated seat under this category has secured 2612 rank. It is, therefore, submitted that the respondents have appropriately applied reservation and the petitioner has not been able to secure admission on account of his low merit.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that Minutes of Meeting dated 12.07.2017, which is being relied upon by the respondents for allocation of seat for the reserved category, has not been made known in the prospectus and that such decision is being arbitrarily applied.

5. We are not impressed by the submission of the petitioner inasmuch as the specific stand of the respondents that the roster system is being continuously applied since 2017 is not shown to be incorrect. Once allocation of seat has to be made by the respondents for different categories, the following of roster system, uniformly, cannot be said to be an arbitrary method followed by the State for allocation of seats.

6. It is, otherwise, undisputed that there are 7 seats which would fall in the concerned category and the candidates who have been granted admission in this category have all secured higher merit than the

petitioner. There is, otherwise, nothing on record to show that the respondents have acted in an arbitrary manner or have admitted students by ignoring the respective merit.

7. Once that be so, some play in the joints will have to be conceded to the authorities in implementing the reservation. We find no error in the methodology followed by the respondents for the purpose. Accordingly, the present writ petition is found to be devoid of any merit and is dismissed.

8. The respondents, however, undertake that from the next year onwards they shall specify in the prospectus the methodology that is being followed since 2017 for allocation of seats.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 11, 2025
Rahul Joshi

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