



\$~67

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

+ **W.P.(C) 19423/2025**

**RVS ACADEMY PHARMACY AND PARAMEDICAL
COLLEGE**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mayank Manish, Mr. Ravi Kant,
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay and Mr. Jayant Dubey,
Advocates.

versus

PHARMACY COUNCIL OF INDIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, Standing
Counsel.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

22.12.2025

%

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

“(a) quash the decision letter dated 13.11.2025 issued by the Respondent, whereby it has rejected approval to Petitioner for applied D.Pharm course, for the academic session 2025-26; and

(b) direct the Respondent, to grant approval to petitioner for applied D.Pharm course for academic session 2026-27.”

2. It is the case of the Petitioner that pursuant to invitation of applications by PCI, Petitioner submitted an application seeking approval of D.Pharm course for academic session 2024-2025, which was rejected. Petitioner challenged the rejection by filing M.A. Diary No. 2897/2025, in Civil Appeal No. 9048/2012. By common order dated 28.04.2025, the application was disposed of by the Supreme Court, observing that if Petitioner paid the inspection fee for academic session 2025-26, the matter will be re-examined and fresh decision will be taken by PCI. On M.A. No.



711/2025 being filed by PCI, the Supreme Court extended the time for completion of approval process upto 31.08.2025 and for appeals/compliance process till 30.09.2025.

3. It is stated that Petitioner submitted its online application on 19.06.2025 for approval of D.Pharm course for academic session 2025-26 along with relevant documents and requisite fee. On 31.07.2025, PCI sent an email stating that Petitioner had failed to submit the SIF, in response to which Petitioner sent several communications pointing out that SIF had been submitted. Petitioner filed W.P. (C) No. 14791/2025 seeking direction to PCI to grant approval since extended date was about to lapse. On 25.09.2025, Court directed PCI to grant approval, upon the Petitioner furnishing an undertaking to PCI that it shall comply with all requirements, which the Petitioner did on the same day. PCI did not take the necessary action and Petitioner filed a contempt petition, however, before it was listed, PCI passed the impugned order dated 13.11.2025, rejecting the application for approval alleging that there were deficiencies, which were not a part of earlier rejection letter.

4. Challenging the impugned decision letter dated 13.11.2025, learned counsel for the Petitioner urges that the alleged deficiencies notified in the said decision were never communicated earlier to the Petitioner and no show cause notice was issued. Even the report of inspection carried out on 13.11.2025 was not furnished and as a result of these lapses by PCI, Petitioner did not get an opportunity to examine the deficiencies noted in the report and to cure them. To compound the illegality, PCI passed the impugned order in a haste on the same day and Petitioner was given no chance to explain that the institute was compliant.

5. Issue notice.



6. Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, learned Standing Counsel accepts notice on behalf of PCI and submits that the inspection report was uploaded by PCI on the PCI portal on 13.11.2025 itself and thus it cannot be said that the same was not made available to the Petitioner. It is urged that there is no infirmity in the impugned decision and the approval application was rightly rejected since several deficiencies were noted during inspection.

7. Heard.

8. There is no dispute that the impugned decision letter dated 13.11.2025 rejecting the approval application of the Petitioner for D.Pharm course is predicated on alleged deficiencies of faculty etc., which were noticed during the inspection conducted by the Inspectors of PCI on the same day. Counsel for PCI is unable to show readily that the inspection report was uploaded on PCI's portal. Even assuming that this is factually correct, it is apparent that no chance was given to the Petitioner to cure the alleged deficiencies since the impugned decision was taken on the same day. It needs no emphasis that if deficiencies/shortcomings are noticed during inspection, opportunity is required to be given to an institute to cure and rectify them. It is inconceivable in law that an order can be passed against a party affecting its civil rights, without putting it to notice of the alleged deficiencies and affording a chance to remove/cure them. On this short ground, impugned decision is untenable and cannot be sustained.

9. Accordingly, this writ petition is allowed setting aside impugned decision letter dated 13.11.2025. It is directed that PCI will furnish a copy of the inspection report dated 13.11.2025 to the Petitioner within two weeks from today. Petitioner will take necessary steps to cure the deficiencies and submit a compliance report within three weeks from the date of receipt of the inspection report. PCI will re-consider the matter after looking into the



response of the Petitioner and take a fresh decision, in accordance with law. Decision will be communicated to the Petitioner and if aggrieved, Petitioner will be at liberty to take recourse to legal remedies.

10. Writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

JYOTI SINGH, J

DECEMBER 22, 2025/YA