



\$~53

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

+ **W.P.(C) 17984/2025**

KRISHNA INSTITUTE OF PHARMACY

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Chandrashekhar Singh and Mr.
Ayush Anand, Advocates.

versus

PHARMACY COUNCIL OF INDIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

%

27.11.2025

1. This writ petition is filed on behalf of the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs:-

“(a) issue a writ of certiorari thereby quashing the decision letter dated 13.11.2025 issued by Respondent, whereby it has rejected approval to Petitioner Institution for the applied B. Pharm course, for the academic session 2025- 26; and

(b) issue a writ of mandamus thereby directing the Respondent, to grant approval to petitioner for the aforesaid B. pharm course for academic session 2026- 27.”

2. On 10.06.2019, Respondent/PCI granted approval to the Petitioner for conducting D.Pharm Course from academic session 2019-2020 and between 2019 to 2024, Petitioner received extensions of the approval granted and has been conducting the course ever since. By circular dated 17.12.2024, PCI invited applications for approval/extension of approval of new/existing courses, fresh approval for other courses for academic session 2025-2026.



3. It is stated that Petitioner applied in January, 2025 for extension of approval for D.Pharm Course as also for fresh approval for B.Pharm Course along with relevant documents and requisite fee. PCI processed the application but vide Decision Letter dated 25.02.2025 rejected approval for B.Pharm Course, whereas for D.Pharm Course the matter was stated to be under process. Petitioner submitted its compliance to the deficiencies pointed out in respect of B.Pharm Course and after the Supreme Court extended the cut-off date for completion of approval process, PCI processed the application of the Petitioner and carried out physical inspection on 01.06.2025. As per the inspection report, all data was verified as per SIF. By Decision Letter dated 24.08.2025, PCI granted approval for D.Pharm Course but for B.Pharm Course the status indicated was 'Not Approved (Compliance Pending)' and Petitioner was directed to remove the deficiencies and Petitioner submitted its comprehensive compliance on 31.08.2025.

4. It is stated that another physical inspection was carried out on 26.09.2025 and it was noted in the inspection report that all the documents were verified as per the SIF, however, by Decision Letter dated 30.09.2025 approval was again rejected. Accordingly, Petitioner sent representation to re-look into the matter. Petitioner thereafter filed W.P.(C) 983/2025 in the Supreme Court for quashing Decision Letter dated 30.09.2025. The writ petition was taken up along with M.A. No. 1987/2025 filed by PCI in C.A. No. 9048/2012 for extension of time to complete the approval process. Both were taken up together and vide order dated 31.10.2025, the writ petition was disposed of along with other writ petitions recording the stand of PCI that it will reconsider the grant of approval for applied courses.



5. It is stated that in light of the order of the Supreme Court, Petitioner wrote to PCI on 03.11.2025 to grant approval for B.Pharm Course for academic session 2025-2026. On 04.11.2025, PCI informed the Petitioner telephonically that an inspection was proposed for 06.11.2025, in response to which Petitioner sent an e-mail on the same day requesting PCI to convey deficiency, if any, owing to which approval was earlier rejected and sought time to rectify the same prior to the proposed inspection. However, PCI conducted the inspection on 06.11.2025, without considering the request of the Petitioner and without pointing out the deficiencies, if any, and later passed the impugned order dated 13.11.2025 rejecting the approval for B.Pharm Course citing the reason that faculty was not available for the said course, without intimating the deficiencies noticed and without furnishing the inspection report.

6. Mr. Sharawat, learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner submits that at the outset that Petitioner does not press this writ petition for academic session 2025-2026 and will restrict the reliefs sought to the next academic session. It is argued that in the two inspections conducted on 01.06.2025 and 26.09.2025, it was found that all data as per SIF was thoroughly verified and while some deficiencies were found but efforts were made by the Petitioner to cure them and compliances were submitted, which were completely overlooked. The glaring illegality in the impugned decision dated 13.11.2025 is that without informing the Petitioner of the deficiencies noticed during the inspection conducted on 06.11.2025 and without furnishing the inspection report, approval for B.Pharm Course is rejected on the ground that no faculty was available. It is urged that impugned order be set aside with a direction to PCI to furnish the inspection report and grant



the Petitioner opportunity to cure the deficiency, after which a fresh decision may be taken.

7. Issue notice.

8. Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the Respondent.

9. It is not disputed by PCI that inspection was carried out on the premises of the Petitioner college on 06.11.2025. It is equally undisputed that no communication was sent to the Petitioner intimating the deficiencies, if any, noticed during the inspection and in fact even the inspection report was not furnished. The consequence is that Petitioner was unaware of the deficiencies and had no opportunity to cure them. Overlooking this glaring lapse, PCI took a decision on 13.11.2025 to reject the approval for B.Pharm Course and for the first time it was brought out in the said Decision Letter that no faculty was available. It is also a pleaded case of the Petitioner that on being informed telephonically on 04.11.2025 by PCI that inspection was proposed on 06.11.2025, Petitioner had sent an e-mail on the same day requesting PCI to point out the deficiencies, if any, so that corrective measures could be taken before the inspection, however, completely oblivious of this request, PCI proceeded to conduct the inspection on 06.11.2025 and did not supply copy of the inspection report. Petitioner is thus right in its contention that the impugned order rejecting the approval is untenable having been passed without even intimating to the Petitioner the deficiencies noticed during the inspection and without furnishing copy of the report and on this short ground the impugned order deserves to be set aside.

10. Accordingly, this writ petition is partially allowed to the aforesaid extent directing PCI to furnish a copy of the inspection report in respect of



inspection conducted on 06.11.2025 to the Petitioner within one week from today. It will be open to the Petitioner to take requisite steps and measures to cure the deficiencies pointed out and send a response to PCI within two weeks thereafter. Needless to state that if more time will be required by the Petitioner to cure the deficiencies, it may seek extension from PCI to do the needful and thereafter send a comprehensive response. On receipt of the response, it will be open to PCI to take a final decision, in accordance with law. The needful shall be done within two weeks from the date final response is received from the Petitioner. It is made clear that the decision will be applicable for academic session 2026-2027.

11. Writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case and leaving all rights and contentions of the parties open.

JYOTI SINGH, J

NOVEMBER 27, 2025

S.Sharma