



\$~128 & 129

- * **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 14898/2025 & CM APPL. 61324/2025
RGS COLLEGE OF PHARMACYPetitioner
Through: Mr. Chandrashekhar Singh, Adv.
versus
PHARMACY COUNCIL OF INDIARespondent
Through: Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, Mr. Yatharth Singh, Mr. Divesh Kr and Ms. Shrishti Gautam, Advs. for PCI.
- + W.P.(C) 14900/2025 & CM APPL. 61329/2025
DR MITHLESH MANI TRIPATHI COLLEGE OF PHARMACYPetitioner
Through: Mr. Chandrashekhar Singh, Adv.
versus
PHARMACY COUNCIL OF INDIARespondent
Through: Mr. Yatharth Singh, Mr. Divesh Kr and Ms. Shrishti Gautam, Advs. for PCI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **25.09.2025**

1. The present petitions have been filed seeking following relief:

*“(a) quashing of the Decision Letter dated 25.08.2025 issued by the Respondent, to the extent of it rejecting the Approval for M-Pharm course to the Petitioner Institution for the present Academic Session 2025-26; completely ignoring the compliance made/documents provided by Petitioner Institution, including a clarificatory letter issued by the Affiliating University to the Respondent Itself; and
(b) direction to Respondent to process the application of petitioner institution, de-hors the requirement of Consent of Affiliation / No Objection Certificate from the Affiliating University, and consequently grant approval to Petitioner Institution for the applied M-Pharm course from the Academic Session 2025-26; expeditiously and preferably before 30.09.2025 i.e. the cut-off date fixed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court, for the said purpose, for academic session*



2025-26 [in Appeal matters].”

2. At the outset, Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, who appears on behalf of the respondent/PCI on advance notice, points out that in the present case no inspection has been carried out and there is no time available to undertake an inspection as the timeline for the said purpose had already elapsed.

1. He submits that the application of the petitioners will be considered for the next academic session, and the petitioners may apply for the next academic session and his application will be considered in accordance with law.

2. In view of the above statement, Mr. Chandrashekhar Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners does not wish to press the present petition.

3. The petitions are dismissed as withdrawn.

4. At this stage, Mr. Chandrashekhar Singh submits that the petitioners while making application had deposited substantial amount of fee for the approval of M. Pharm course. However, since the inspection has not been carried out, he urges the Court that the fee that has been deposited for the academic session 2025-26 may be considered as fee for the next session.

5. Having regard to the submission made by Mr. Chandrashekhar Singh and in the peculiar facts of the case, the respondent/PCI is directed to treat fee deposited by the petitioners *qua* approval of M. Pharm course for the academic session 2025-26, be adjusted towards the fee against application seeking approval for next academic session 2026-27.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 25, 2025/dss