

06/01
2026

AD-46/24
266312
NANDY

(OP)

**In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

WPA 30091 of 2024

**ABDUL MUSTAK ALAM
Vs.
THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & ORS.**

Mr. Malay Bhattacharya, Advocate
Ms. Arifa Sultana, Advocate

.....for the Petitioner

Mr. Washaf Ali Mondal, Advocate

.....for the University

1. The petitioner's grievance is that in spite of having completed his course work for the Ph.D in Sanskrit discipline, sometime in 2018, the petitioner was not allotted a Supervisor.
2. Mr. Bhattacharya, learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that even though the petitioner has shifted to an inter-disciplinary subject (Philosophy), there was no Supervisor allotted to him. Without a Supervisor, the petitioner was not even registered in the Ph.D programme. The timeline for submission of the thesis for the Ph.D had lapsed sometime in December 2024. In fact, in spite of repeated requests by the petitioner in February & March 2024, no Supervisor was allotted to him.
3. Mr. Bhattacharya referred to the reports filed by the respondents, wherein it has been clearly admitted that there was an insufficiency of teachers on account whereof, a Supervisor could not have been allotted to the petitioner.
4. Mr. Mondal, learned Advocate appearing for the answering respondent, the University, submits that the petitioner had made a request at the fag end of his tenure to complete the Ph.D programme, only in

February/March 2024. The timeline was to end in December 2024. Hence, it was not possible to allot a suitable Supervisor to the petitioner to enable him to complete the Ph.D programme.

5. Reference is being drawn to the Regulations of the University, wherein Clause 8.2 read with Clause 4.3 of the University Grant Commission (UGC) Notification of 05.05.2016, clearly indicates that the University is to deal with extensions beyond the limit stipulated in such Notification in accordance with the relevant clauses stipulated in the Statute/Ordinance of the individual Institutions concerned.
6. In this matter, as Regulation 8.2 clearly empowers the authority to extend such time which is in consonance with Clause 4.3 of the Notification, I direct the petitioner to approach the Board of Research and Studies (BRS) who will consider the petitioner's case as made out in the writ-petition and pass necessary orders extending the time by any length as it may deem fit to ensure that the petitioner is able to complete the Ph.D programme.
7. However, the concerned BRS will also keep in mind that the time for completion of the Ph.D programme has already expired and will accordingly limit such time to ensure expeditious submission of the petitioner's thesis to clear the Ph.D programme.
8. The petitioner will approach the BRS by 15.01.2026.
9. The BRS will dispose of the said application on both counts of extension and appointment of Supervisor by 31.01.2026 and intimate the same to the petitioner at the earliest.
10. With the afore-stated directions, **WPA 30091 of 2024 is disposed of.** No order as to costs.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)

