



\$~102

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

+ **W.P.(C) 18858/2025**

DAVARA SCHOOL OF PHARMACY

.....Petitioner

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

versus

PHARMACY COUNCIL OF INDIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh and Mr. Yatharth Singh, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

15.12.2025

%

1. This writ petition is filed by 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 14.11.2025 issued by the Respondent, whereby it has rejected approval to Petitioner Institution for the applied D. Pharm and B. Pharm courses, for the academic session 2025-26; and

b) issue a writ of mandamus thereby directing the Respondent, to grant approval to petitioner for applied D. Pharm and B. Pharm courses for the academic session 2026-27; and/or

c) pass any such other/further order, as this Hon'ble Court may deems fit and proper in the facts & circumstances of the present case and also in the interest of justice.”

2. Case of the Petitioner is that pursuant to PCI circular dated 17.12.2024, it submitted an online application in January, 2025 seeking approval for D.Pharm and B.Pharm courses for academic session 2025-2026



with relevant documents and requisite fee. PCI issued decision letter dated 24.02.2025 rejecting the approval and pointing out certain deficiencies. Petitioner wrote to PCI on 12.03.2025 pointing out the compliances. Physical inspection was carried out by PCI on 07.07.2025 in which deficiencies were pointed out by the inspection team. Petitioner took necessary steps to remove the deficiencies and uploaded comprehensive compliances on PCI web portal on 25.08.2025. However, vide decision letter dated 17.09.2025, PCI rejected the approval for both courses without any reason. Being aggrieved, Petitioner approached the Supreme Court by filing W.P.(C) 992/2025, which was disposed on 31.10.2025 directing PCI to reconsider the case on or before 15.11.2025, which was the extended cut off date.

3. It is further submitted that by e-mail dated 03.11.2025, Petitioner requested Registrar, PCI to re-consider the application for grant of approval in view of the decision of the Supreme Court. An inspection was carried out on 13.11.2025 but no deficiencies were brought to the notice of the Petitioner. On the very next day i.e. on 14.11.2025 the impugned order was passed rejecting the approval. No deficiencies were brought to the notice of the Petitioner and no opportunity was given to remove them before passing the impugned order.

4. In light of these facts, Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, learned Senior Counsel submits that at this stage Petitioner will be satisfied if PCI is directed to issue a show cause notice highlighting the deficiencies and giving opportunity to the Petitioner to remove the same and submit a response, as has been done by this Court in several matters.

5. Issue notice.



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

7. From the aforesaid facts, it is apparent that PCI conducted the physical inspection on 13.11.2025 and on the very next day, impugned order was passed rejecting the approval for D.Pharm and B.Pharm courses. No communication was sent by PCI pointing out the deficiencies after the physical inspection and no opportunity was given to remove them or submit a representation prior to rejection. This violates principles of natural justice and cannot be countenanced in law.

8. Accordingly, for the aforesaid reason the impugned order dated 14.11.2025 is set aside. Without entering into the merits of the case and in light of several orders passed by this Court in similar circumstances in ***Ambika Institute of Pharmacy v. Pharmacy Council of India, 2025 SCC OnLine Del 8405; Madhu Vachaspati Institute of Pharmacy, Through its Registrar v. Pharmacy Council of India, Through its Registrar Cum Member Secretary, 2023 SCC OnLine Del 282; and Krishna Institute of Pharmacy v. Pharmacy Council of India, W.P.(C) 17984/2025***, decided on 27.11.2025, PCI is directed to issue notice to the Petitioner pointing out the deficiencies and calling upon the Petitioner to respond and make a representation. On receipt of the notice, Petitioner will make a representation within two weeks, whereafter it will be open to PCI to pass a fresh order on the application seeking approval, in accordance with law. The order will be passed within three weeks from the date of receipt of representation from the Petitioner and will be communicated to the Petitioner within one week from the date of decision.

9. In case of any grievance, it will be open to the Petitioner to take



recourse to legal remedies. It is made clear that Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and all rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

10. Petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

JYOTI SINGH, J

DECEMBER 15, 2025/RW