



\$~45

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1484/2025**

ANJALI COLLEGE OF PHARMACY AND SCIENCE.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Aseem Mehrotra and Ms.
Deeksha Mehrotra, Advocates.

versus

DR. MONTU M. PATEL & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Vinay Kr. Garg, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Ajay Kr. Singh, Mr. Yatharth
Singh, Mr. K.S. Rekhi and Ms.
Shrishti Gautam, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

13.11.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition under Section 2(b) read with Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act seeks following prayers:-

“[a] initiate Contempt Proceedings against the Contemnors u/s 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 for violating the direction contained in the judgment order dated 19.09.2025 and 23.09.2025 passed by this Hon'ble Court in W.P. [C] No. 6012 of 2025;

[b] pass such other order(s) or further order(s) as this Hon 'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. *Vide* order dated 19.09.2025 in W.P.(C) 6012/2025, following directions were passed:-

“10. In that view of the matter, respondent no.1/PCI is directed to treat the affidavit of respondent no.2/University as consent of respondent no.2/University, which is the examining authority, for the aforesaid course for the Academic Session 2025-26.



11. The respondent no.1/PCI is further directed to process the application of petitioner in accordance with law, subject to completion of other formalities.”

4. Subsequently, on an application being CM APPL. 60704/2025 filed on behalf of the petitioner/applicant, seeking modification of the order dated 19.09.2025, the following directions were passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court on 23.09.2025:-

“2. Mr. Aseem Mehrotra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner invites attention of the Court to order dated 19.09.2025, to contend that while directing the respondent/PCI to process the application of petitioner in accordance with law, inadvertently, there was no timeline fixed for deciding the said application.

4. Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent/PCI accepts notice.

5. He submits that the application of petitioner will be decided latest by 27.09.2025.

6. Let needful be done, as undertaken.”

5. During the pendency of the present proceedings learned Senior Counsel for the respondents had sought time to comply with the aforesaid directions after necessary instructions.

6. Learned Senior Counsel for the respondents submits that upon inspection carried out by the respondents, deficiencies were pointed out for which compliance report had been placed on record and the order rejecting the approval on account of introduction of new courses and enhancement of sites has been passed yesterday, *i.e.*, 12.11.2025 and the same has been communicated to the petitioner.



7. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to initiate appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.
8. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

NOVEMBER 13, 2025/sn/db