**RESERVED ON 04TH AUGUST 2026**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026**

**PRESENT**

**THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE**

**AND**

**THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA**

**WRIT APPEAL NO.1060 OF 2025 (EDN-RES)**

**BETWEEN:**

KARNATAKA STATE LAW UNIVERSITY
NAVANAGAR, HUBBALLI,
KARNATAKA-580025
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR.

…APPELLANT

(BY SMT. JAYNA KOTHARI, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. GIRISHKUMAR R., ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. RAKESH SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
S/O KARUNAKAR SHETTY,
R/AT HEENKILA HOSAMANE HIRGANA
KARKALA TALUK,
UDUPI DISTRICT-576117.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINICPAL SECRETARY,
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
M.S. BUILDING, AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560001.
3. SOUNDARYA COLLEGE OF LAW
SOUNDARYANAGARA SIDEDAHALLI,
NAGASANDRA POST,
BENGALURU-560073.

Digitally signed by
MAHALAKSHMI B M
Location: High Court
of Karnataka

4. KARNATAKA STATE BAR COUNCIL (KSBC),
ADJACENT TO HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,
OLD ELECTION COMMISSION BUILDING,
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDI, BENGALURU,
KARNATAKA-560001.

(RESPONDENT NO.4 IMPLEADED AS PER
COURT ORDER DATED 30.06.2026)

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. K. PRASANNA SHETTY, ADVOCATE FOR R-1;
SMT. NAMITHA MAHESH B.G., AGA FOR R-2;
SRI. T.P. VIVEKANANDA, ADVOCATE FOR R-4;
NOTICE TO R-3 IS SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 09.12.2024 PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE, HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA BENGALURU IN W.P.NO.31737/2024 AND ETC.,

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR JUDGMENT, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS PRONOUNCED AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU ,CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

**C.A.V. JUDGMENT**

(PER: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA)

1. The Karnataka State Law University [**University**] has preferred this *intra*-court appeal, calling in question the order dated 09.12.2024 [**impugned order**] passed by the learned Single Judge

of this Court in W.P. No.31737/2024 (EDN-RES), whereby the learned Single Judge allowed the writ petition filed by respondent No.1, set aside the endorsement dated 18.10.2024 issued by the University and directed issuance of an eligibility certificate to respondent No.1 for admission to the three year LL.B course.

2. The principal question arising for consideration in this appeal is:

> "Whether, a candidate having obtained a recognized "First Degree", after prosecuting a regular course of study, satisfies the eligibility criteria prescribed under Rule 5(a) of the Bar Council of India, Rules of Legal Education, 2008 for admission to the three Year LL.B course?"

3. Respondent No.1 completed his SSLC in the year 1997, and thereafter, completed his Job-Oriented Pre-University Diploma in Computer Techniques [**JOC**] in the year 1999. Subsequently, he pursued the Bachelor of Commerce [**B.Com**] course and completed his graduation from Mangalore University in the year 2004. The B.Com degree was conferred on him by Mangalore University at its Convocation held on 24.01.2005. He was also gainfully employed in a private company for several years.

4. In the year 2024, respondent No.1 desired to pursue the three year LL.B course and submitted an online application dated

24.06.2024 through respondent No.3, Soundarya College of Law. The college accepted his application and respondent No.1 paid the prescribed fee for the academic year 2024-2025.

5. The application was thereafter forwarded to the University for issuance of an eligibility certificate. By endorsement dated 18.10.2024, the University declined to issue the eligibility certificate, proceeding on the basis that in terms of Government Order dated 06.08.2021, respondent No.1's JOC qualification could not be treated as equivalent to Pre-University Course [**PUC**]. Aggrieved by the said endorsement, respondent No.1 approached this Court by filing W.P.No.31737/2024 (EDN-RES).

**Impugned order**

6. The learned Single Judge allowed the writ petition, quashed the endorsement dated 18.10.2024 issued by the University and directed to issue the eligibility certificate.

7. The learned Single Judge held that Rule 5(a) of the Rules of Legal Education, 2008 [**the Rules**] framed by the Bar Council of India [**BCI**] in Part IV of the Bar Council of India Rules [**BCI Rules**] governs admission to the three year LL.B. course. Further, it was noticed that Rule 5(a) of the Rules provides that an applicant who

has graduated in any discipline of knowledge from a recognized university, may apply for a three years' degree program in law.

8. The proviso to Rule 5 also refers to the "+2 Higher Secondary Pass Certificate or First Degree Certificate" in the context of candidates who have pursued their studies through distance or correspondence method. The requirement of a +2 Higher Secondary Pass Certificate applies to the five year integrated course and First Degree Certificate applies to the candidates seeking admission to the three year LL.B course. The learned Single Judge further held that the Explanation to Rule 5 relates only to graduation/post graduation obtained through the Open University system and would not be applicable in determining the eligibility of a candidate for the three year LL.B course.

9. The learned Single Judge further held that respondent No.1 had admittedly obtained a recognised B.Com degree from Mangalore University and therefore, possessed the requisite First Degree qualification. Consequently, the question as to whether his earlier JOC qualification was equivalent to PUC did not arise for determining his eligibility for admission to the three year LL.B course. The University was accordingly directed to issue the eligibility certificate.

10. Aggrieved by the impugned order, the University has preferred the present appeal.

11. Ms. Jayna Kothari, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the University, submits that the educational progression contemplated for admission to the three year LL.B. course is 10+2 followed by three years of graduation. The graduation degree cannot, therefore, be viewed in isolation so as to dispense with the foundational 10+2 qualification. She submits that Rule 5 of the Rules has been misinterpreted by the learned Single Judge.

12. Secondly, it is contended that the clarification issued by the BCI in 2017, provides that the basic qualification for the five year integrated law course is 10$^{th}$ standard followed by +2, whereas, for the three year LL.B course, the basic qualification is 10 +2 followed by a three year graduation.

13. Reliance is placed upon the decision of the Co-Ordinate Bench of this Court in **Krishnamurthy D.H. and Another Vs. State of Karnataka and others**[1], contending that the said decision recognises the necessity of fulfilling the prescribed conditions before JOC qualification can be treated as equivalent to PUC. It is,

[1] W.P. No.24206/2021 (S-KAT) D.D.28.03.2022

therefore, contended that in the absence of a valid 10+2/PUC qualification, the subsequent acquisition of a B.Com degree cannot cure the defect; and on that basis the endorsement dated 18.10.2024 issued by the University is sought to be sustained.

14. The learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1, on the other hand, submits that the University's entire case proceeds on an incorrect premise. It is submitted that respondent No.1 had already obtained a recognized B.Com degree in 2005, and it is this "First Degree" that constitutes the basis of his eligibility under Rule 5(a) of the Rules.

15. **Krishnamurthy's** (*supra*) decision is sought to be distinguished on the ground that the case concerned candidates seeking appointment as Civil Police Constables, where the recruitment notification itself prescribed PUC/12$^{th}$ standard or an equivalent qualification as the minimum educational qualification. The candidates therein were relying upon their JOC qualification to satisfy that requirement. Whereas, in the instant case the admission sought is to the three year LL.B. course, for which the relevant qualification under Rule 5(a) of the Rules is a "First Degree".

**Reasons and conclusions**

16. The Advocates Act, 1961 [**Advocates Act**] was enacted to amend and consolidate the law relating to legal practitioners and to provide for the constitution of Bar Councils and an All India Bar. Section 4 of the Advocates Act provides for the constitution of the BCI. The functions of the BCI are set out in sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the Advocates Act, which reads as follows:

> "**7. Functions of Bar Council of India.-**(1) The functions of the Bar Council of India shall be
>
> (a) [x x x]
>
> (b) to lay down standards of professional conduct and etiquette for advocates;
>
> (c) to lay down the procedure to be followed by its disciplinary committee and the disciplinary committee of each State Bar Council;
>
> (d) to safeguard the rights, privileges and interests of advocates;
>
> (e) to promote and support law reform;
>
> (f) to deal with and dispose of any matter arising under this Act, which may be referred to it by a State Bar Council;
>
> (g) to exercise general supervision and control over State Bar Councils;
>
> (h) to promote legal education and to lay down standards of such education in consultation with the Universities in India imparting such education and the State Bar Councils;
>
> (i) to recognise Universities whose degree in law shall be a qualification for enrolment as an

> advocate and for that purpose to visit and inspect Universities or cause the State Bar Councils to visit and inspect Universities in accordance with such directions as it may give in this behalf;
>
> (ia) to conduct seminars and organise talks on legal topics by eminent jurists and publish journals and papers of legal interest;
>
> (ib) to organise legal aid to the poor in the prescribed manner;
>
> (ic) to recognise on a reciprocal basis foreign qualifications in law obtained outside India for the purpose of admission as an advocate under this Act;
>
> (j) to manage and invest the funds of the Bar Council;
>
> (k) to provide for the election of its members;
>
> (l) to perform all other functions conferred on it by or under this Act;
>
> (m) to do all other things necessary for discharging the aforesaid functions;"

17. In exercise of the powers conferred upon it under the Advocates Act, the Bar Council of India has framed the Rules in consultation with the Universities and the State Bar Councils.

18. In the present case, respondent No.1 has successfully completed his degree in Commerce and has been awarded a B.Com degree. The relevant clauses of Rule 2 of the Rules, setting out the definition of certain terms relevant to the context of the present appeal, are set out below :

"**2. Definitions:**

(vi) **"Bachelor degree in law"** means and includes a degree in law conferred by the University recognized by the Bar Council of India for the purpose of the Act and includes a bachelor degree in law after any bachelor degree in science, arts, commerce, engineering, medicine, or any other discipline of a University for a period of study not less than three years or an integrated bachelor degree combining the course of a first bachelor degree in any subject and also the law running together in concert and compression for not less than a period of five years after 10+2 or 11+1 courses as the case may be.

(viii) **"First Degree"** means Bachelor Degree in any branch of knowledge such as Arts, Fine Arts; Science, Commerce, Management, Medicine, Engineering, Pharmacy, Technology etc. conferred by Universities or any other qualifications awarded by an institution/authority recognized by the Bar Council of India, from time to time.

(xiii) **"Integrated Degree course in law"** means double degree course comprising the bachelor degree in any branch of knowledge prosecuted simultaneously with the Degree course in law in such an integrated manner as may be designed by the University concerned for a continuous period of not less than five years.

(xxii) **"Recognized University"** means a University whose degree in law is recognized by the Bar Council of India under these Rules.

(xxvi) **"Second degree"** means a course of study leading to degree, which can be prosecuted only after obtaining a bachelor degree."

19. There is no dispute that the B.Com degree awarded to respondent No.1 falls within the meaning of the expression 'First Degree' as defined under clause (viii) of Rule 2 of the Rules.

20. Rule 5 of the Rules sets out the eligibility conditions for admission to a Three Year Law Degree Course and Integrated Degree Program. The interpretation of the said Rule is central to the controversy involved in the present appeal. The said Rule is reproduced below:

> "**5. Eligibility for admission:**
>
> (a) **Three Year Law Degree Course:** An applicant who has graduated in any discipline of knowledge from a University established by an Act of Parliament or by a State legislature or an equivalent national institution recognized as a Deemed to be University or foreign University recognized as equivalent to the status of an Indian University by an authority competent to declare equivalence, may apply for a three years' degree program in law leading to conferment of LL.B. degree on successful completion of the regular program conducted by a University whose degree in law is recognized by the Bar Council of India for the purpose of enrolment.
>
> (b) **Integrated Degree Program:** An applicant who has successfully completed Senior Secondary School course ('+2') or equivalent (such as 11+1, 'A' level in Senior School Leaving certificate course) from a recognized University of India or outside or from a Senior Secondary Board or equivalent, constituted or recognized by the Union or by a State Government or from any equivalent institution from a foreign country recognized by the government of that country for the purpose of issue of qualifying certificate on successful completion of the course, may apply for and be admitted into the program of the Centres of Legal Education to obtain the integrated degree in law with a degree in any other subject as the first degree from the University whose such a degree in law is recognized by the Bar Council of India for the purpose of enrolment.
>
> Provided that applicants who have obtained +2 Higher Secondary Pass Certificate or First Degree Certificate after prosecuting studies in distance or correspondence method shall also be considered as eligible

> for admission in the Integrated Five Years course or three years' LL.B. course, as the case may be.
>
> **Explanation**: The applicants who have obtained 10 +2 or graduation / post graduation through open Universities system directly without having any basic qualification for prosecuting such studies are not eligible for admission in the law courses."

21. There is no dispute that Mangalore University, which awarded the B.Com degree to respondent No.1 is a University established by an Act of the State Legislature within the meaning of Rule 5(a) of the Rules.

22. The explanation to Rule 5 of the Rules expressly provides that applicants who have obtained a qualification of (10+2) or graduation / post-graduation through open universities system directly, without having any basic qualification for prosecuting "such studies", are not eligible for admission in the Law Courses. It thus follows that the qualification on the basis of which admissions are sought to either a three year Law degree course or an integrated degree program should not have been obtained without the basic qualification required for prosecuting "such studies".

23. In the present case, respondent No.1 contends that he satisfies the eligibility criteria for admission to the three year law degree course on the basis of his B.Com qualification, which, as

stated earlier, falls within the meaning of a "first degree" as defined under clause (viii) of Rule 2 of the Rules.

24. There is no dispute that respondent No.1 was admitted to the B.Com degree course at Bhuvanendra College, Karkala, which is affiliated with Mangalore University and successfully completed the said course. According to the University, respondent No.1 is ineligible for admission to the three year law degree course by virtue of the explanation to Rule 5 of the Rules.

25. It is also relevant to refer to the proviso to Rule 5 of the Rules, which expressly provides that applicants, who have obtained a Higher Secondary (+2) pass certificate or a first degree certificate after pursuing their studies through distance or correspondence method shall also be eligible for admission to the integrated five year law course or three year LL.B course, as the case may be.

26. Thus, a student who has obtained Higher Secondary (+2) pass certificate through correspondence method would also be eligible for admission to the integrated five year law course. However, the Explanation to Rule 5 would render such a student ineligible if the (10+2) qualification had been obtained directly

through Open University system without possessing the basic qualification required for obtaining the (+2) Higher Secondary pass certificate.

27. Similarly, by virtue of the proviso to Rule 5 of the Rules, an applicant who has secured a ‘first degree’ certificate after prosecuting studies through the distance or correspondence method would be eligible for admission to the three year LL.B course, subject to having acquired the ‘basic qualification’ required for prosecuting ‘such studies’.

28. A plain reading of Rule 5(a) of the Rules, read with the proviso and the Explanation thereto, clearly indicates that the (+2) qualification would not have independent relevance as a qualifying criterion for admission to the three year LL.B course in the case of a candidate who has secured a recognized first degree after possessing the basic qualification required for pursuing the course of study leading to that degree.

29. It is also material to note that respondent No.1 did not obtain his ‘first degree’ certificate through any open university system, but he obtained the degree by prosecuting a regular course of study

after securing admission to a college affiliated with Mangalore University.

30. We may note that Rule 5 of the Rules fell for consideration before the Full Bench of the Bombay High Court in **Vishnu Vs. Bar Council of India and others**[2]. We consider it relevant to set out the following paragraphs:

> "21. An explanation is normally to be read in a manner so as to harmonize with the main section and cannot be construed as to widen or limit the scope and purview of the section. The explanation will have to be construed in a manner that it is read in harmony with the main section. Proviso to Section 5 provides that, a person obtaining + 2 higher secondary pass certificate or first degree certificate after prosecuting studies in distance or correspondence method is also considered as eligible for admission to the law course. Explanation cannot be read as limiting the operation of the provision itself. The criteria for admission to the three year law degree course is that, a candidate should possess a graduate degree i.e. the first degree (Bachelor degree in any branch of knowledge, such as Arts, Fine Arts, Science, Commerce, Management and so on). The only limitation would be that the first degree certificate and/or the first degree shall be from institution recognised by the Bar Council of India from time to time.
>
> 22. The person obtaining the first degree certificate from the Yashwantrao Chavan Maharashtra Open University, Nashik is recognised by the Bar Council of India. We specifically asked the learned counsel for the Bar Council of India as to whether the first degree certificate obtained from Yashwantrao Chavan Maharashtra Open University, Nashik is recognised by the Bar Council of India. Mr. Deshmukh, learned counsel for the Bar Council of India candidly accepted that the first degree certificate from Yashwantrao Chavan Maharashtra Open University, Nashik is recognised by the Bar Council of India for admission to the law course. The explanation prescribes

[2] W.P. No.6752/2021 D.D. 04.05.2022 : CNR No.HCBM030181802021

that the applicants obtaining 10 + 2 or graduation/ postgraduation through Open University system directly without having any basic qualification for prosecuting such studies are not eligible for admission in the law course.

23. The words “basic qualification” appearing in the explanation to Rule 5 is the subject matter of consideration. “Basic qualification” is not defined under the Rules or the Act. In an Open University, for an admission to the Commerce graduation course, the criterion are provided. A person having qualification of H.S.C. or equivalent examination or is 11$^{th}$ Standard Passed, or a Government recognised certificate/ diploma of two years after S.C.C., are eligible for admission, and a person who had undergone a preparatory programme of Yashwantrao Chavan Maharashtra Open University, Nashik with minimum 40 marks is also eligible for admission to the first year degree certificate course. Equivalence is provided to the said courses.

24. Under Government Resolution dated 20/5/2011, the Government of Maharashtra has granted equivalence of 10$^{th}$ and 12$^{th}$ to those who have passed preparatory programme and first year of graduation. The preparatory programme would be the basic course for securing admission to the first degree course in an open University. The basic course for first degree certificate would be different for different institutions. The Bar Council has not restricted the admission to the law degree course to the students passing from a regular University only. Even a student graduating in any discipline of knowledge from a equivalent national institution recognised as a deemed to be University or even a foreign University recognised as equivalent to the status of an Indian University by an authority competent to declare equivalence can apply for three year degree programme in law. It is not necessary that a foreign University recognised as equivalent to the status of an Indian University may require 10 + 2 as a basic qualification for the first degree course. A person who has completed 10 + 2 or equivalent is also considered eligible for admission to the five year integrated law degree course as per Rule 5(b).

25. The aspect of basic qualification appearing in explanation would differ from University to University and course to course. The basic qualification for first degree

> course in an Open University would be the preparatory course and/or 12th Standard passed. The basic qualification as is appearing in explanation will have to be given a wider interpretation and cannot be given a restricted interpretation. If restricted interpretation is given to the words “basic qualification” appearing in explanation, then the same would not be in tune and consonance with the main rule. A person who has completed the preparatory programme course from Yashwantrao Chavan Maharashtra Open University, Nashik and who has also completed 10 + 2 from any Board, is eligible for admission to the first degree course in branch of Arts, Commerce, Science. If the restrictive meaning is given to the basic qualification, then a student who has passed graduation from the open University and had earlier completed 10 + 2 from S.S.C. Board would be eligible for admission to the three year law course, but a person who has been admitted to the first degree course in the open University after passing the preparatory programme for the said course, would not be eligible. The same cannot be the intention of the legislature."

31. The Full Bench held that the Explanation to Rule 5 of the Rules cannot be read so as to limit the operation of the main provision. We respectfully concur with the said view.

32. It would not be apposite to read the Explanation in a manner that curtails the plain language of Rule 5(a) of the Rules.

33. Under the said provision, a candidate possessing a Bachelor's Degree in any discipline of knowledge, such as Arts, Fine Arts, Science, Commerce or Management, from a recognized university would be eligible to apply for admission to the three year

law degree course, subject to satisfying the other eligibility requirements prescribed under the Rules.

34. There is no dispute that the B.Com degree awarded to respondent No.1 by Mangalore University is recognized as a 'first degree'. The expression 'basic qualification' occurring in the Explanation to Rule 5 must, therefore, be understood in the context of basic qualification required for pursuing the course of study leading to the first degree. In other words, what is material is whether the candidate possessed the basic qualification prescribed for prosecuting the studies necessary to secure the first degree.

35. We also consider it relevant to refer to the Full Bench decision of the Madras High Court in **M. Ramachandran Vs. Chairman, Law Admissions 2015-2016**[3]**:**

> "40. The language and tenor of Rule 5(a) and 5(b) read with the first proviso and the Explanation make it amply clear that prosecution of a regular course is mandatory only for the immediately previous qualifying certificate and/or degree, for example, graduate degree for the Three Years LLB Course and Senior Secondary Certificate for the Integrated Degree Program. Had the Rules intended otherwise, the Rules would have specifically provided that candidates would not be eligible for admission to the Three Years LLB unless they had obtained the Secondary and Senior Secondary Certificates upon prosecution of studies through a regular course or through distance or correspondence mode. The Bar Council of India has, in its

[3] 2018 SCC OnLine Mad 13663

> wisdom, chosen to frame rules whereunder prosecution of a regular course is mandatory only in respect of the Senor Secondary Certificate for admission to the Integrated Degree Course and in respect of graduation for admission to the Three Years LLB course. We are also of the view that once a recognized university or a recognized board issues a certificate, it is not for any other authority to question the certificate on the ground of ineligibility to obtain the certificate, until and unless the certificate is cancelled by an appropriate authority and/or by a Court of law. To hold otherwise would be to open the pandora's box, for years later certificates might be questioned on grounds such as inadequate attendance, failure to clear internal test examinations and the like and it would be impossible for candidates possessing the degree and/or certificate to adduce cogent materials and/or evidence to satisfy those questioning the certificates. When a regular certificate is granted by a recognized board, there is a presumption that the candidate was eligible to be conferred the certificate."

36. The aforesaid passage also has a bearing on the controversy involved in the present appeal. The Full Bench held that the requirement of prosecuting a regular course relates to the immediately preceding qualifying certificate or degree.

37. In the context of admission to the three year LL.B course, the immediately preceding qualifying degree is the ‘first degree’ obtained from a recognised university. The Full Bench further observed that once a recognised university or board has issued a certificate or degree, another authority cannot question the validity of such certificate or degree on the ground that the candidate was

ineligible to obtain such qualification, unless it has been cancelled by the competent authority or declared invalid by a Court of law.

38. In the present case, respondent No.1 pursued a regular course of study to secure the B.Com degree from Mangalore University. It is not the appellant's case that respondent No.1 was ineligible for admission to the said course on the basis of the qualification possessed by him. Nor is it the appellant's case that the B.Com degree awarded by Mangalore University has been cancelled or otherwise declared invalid.

39. Thus, respondent No.1, having successfully completed a regular course of study and obtained a recognized first degree in commerce from Mangalore University, satisfies the eligibility criteria prescribed under Rule 5(a) of the Rules for admission to the three year LL.B course. The University was, therefore, not justified in declining to issue the eligibility certificate.

40. Insofar as the reliance placed by the learned counsel for the appellant on the decision of the Division Bench of this Court in **Krishnamurthy** (*supra*) is concerned, the said decision is distinguishable on facts. The controversy therein arose in the context of recruitment to the post of Civil Police Constable, for

which the prescribed educational qualification was PUC or its equivalent. The question that arose for consideration was whether the JOC qualification possessed by the candidates could be treated as equivalent to PUC for the purpose of satisfying the prescribed eligibility criteria.

41. In the present case, however, respondent No.1 seeks admission to the three year LL.B course on the strength of a recognized first degree obtained from Mangalore University. The eligibility criteria prescribed under Rule 5 of the Rules are, therefore, materially different. Consequently, the decision in **Krishnamurthy** has no application to the facts of the present case.

42. For the foregoing reasons, we are of the considered view that respondent No.1, having obtained a recognized 'first degree' in commerce from Mangalore University, after prosecuting a regular course of study, satisfies the eligibility criteria prescribed under Rule 5 (a) of the Rules for admission to the three year LL.B. Course.

43. We find no infirmity in the conclusion of the learned Single Judge warranting interference in this intra-Court appeal.

Accordingly, the writ appeal stands dismissed. The order dated 09.12.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge is affirmed.

44. The pending interlocutory applications also stand disposed of.

**Sd/-**
**(VIBHU BAKHRU)**
**CHIEF JUSTICE**

**Sd/-**
**(K.S. HEMALEKHA)**
**JUDGE**

MBM