HC-KAR
NC: 2026:KHC:61357
WP No. 32497 of 2026
CNR: KAHC010718702026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 4TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S SUNIL DUTT YADAV

WRIT PETITION NO. 32497 OF 2026 (EDN-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. MR. ROCHAN N. SHANKAR,
   S/O P SHIVASHANKAR MURTHY
   AGED ABOUT 19 YEARS,
   RESIDING AT NO. 364, 3RD STAGE,
   2ND BLOCK, BASAVESHWARANAGAR,
   BENGALURU - 560 079,
   PRESENTLY PURSUING B.A. LL.B. (HONS.)
   AT THE SCHOOL OF LAW
   RV UNIVERSITY, BENGALURU,
   BEARING USN 1RUA25BAL0035.

... PETITIONER

Digitally signed by PRAKASH N
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

(BY SRI. VENKATESH S ARBATTI., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. RV UNIVERSITY,
   PRIVATE UNIVERSITY ESTABLISHED
   UNDER THE R.V. UNIVERSITY ACT, 2019,
   HAVING ITS CAMPUS AT RV VIDYANIKETAN,
   8TH MILE, MYSURU ROAD,
   BENGALURU - 560 059,
   REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR.

2. THE VICE-CHANCELLOR,
RV UNIVERSITY, RV VIDYANIKETAN,
8TH MILE, MYSURU ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 059.

3. THE REGISTRAR,
RV UNIVERSITY, RV VIDYANIKETAN,
8TH MILE, MYSURU ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 059.

4. THE DEAN
SCHOOL OF LAW, RV UNIVERSITY,
BENGALURU - 560 059.

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SOMASHEKAR, ADVOCATE)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE DECISION/SPREADSHEET/LIST TO THE EXTENT IT RECORDS OR CONTINUES THE PETITIONER AS "NOT PROMOTED" (ANNEXURE-B) ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.1, IF THIS HON'BLE COURT FINDS THAT THE SAME WAS MADE WITHOUT CONSIDERING THE SUBSEQUENT EXAMINATION RESULTS OR BY AN ARBITRARY OR INCONSISTENT APPLICATION OF THE PROGRESSION POLICY VERSION 3.0 (ANNEXURE-D) AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S SUNIL DUTT YADAV

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner is a student of B.A.LLB. (Hons.) programme conducted by the School of Law, RV University, Bengaluru, and has sought to quash the decision/spreadsheet/list to the extent it records or continues the petitioner as "Not Promoted" at Annexure-B. Certain other allied reliefs are also sought for.

2. The facts made out are that the petitioner during his course in the First year had five backlog subjects in First Semester in terms of Annexure-A and during Second Semester, he was unable to attend the classes due to ailment of his mother. It is made out from the facts that the respondent University had by virtue of Annexure-C dated 01.09.2026 extended one-time special examination opportunity to students on account of credit backlog.

3. It is further submitted that the petitioner has availed all such opportunity and consequent to such examination, has earned 36 Credits as reflected in the

Provisional Grade Card dated 08.10.2026. It is submitted that despite petitioner having obtained credits of 36, the respondent University has directed his detention in the same academic year.

4. It is the case made out by the petitioner that prior to 01.09.2026, the University in terms of Annexure-R1 dated 19.08.2026 framed a policy as one-time measure wherein the number of credits required for progressing to the next Semester was reduced to 36. It is the contention of the petitioner that benefit of Annexure-R1 which was about 11 days prior to Annexure-C requires to be extended to the petitioner as well, and that would serve the interest of students taking note of the intention to extend the relief of progression as a one time measure to students in an appropriate manner.

5. Learned Counsel Sri.Somashekar appearing for the respondent University while does not controvert the factual assertion of the petitioner, has however contended

that the benefit of Annexure-C is to be strictly construed and petitioner not having cleared entirety of the shortfall, even after the opportunity in terms of Annexure-C would not be entitled for relaxation in the credit requirements by falling back on Annexure-R1, as Annexure-C had clearly specified that no credit requirement was waived and only an additional attempt that was being made available. It is further contended that undertaking was given by the petitioner pursuant to the opportunity at Annexure-C and petitioner is bound by the same.

6. After having heard both sides, the only question that would fall for consideration is:

> *"whether the student upon attempting to avail one-time benefit in terms of Annexure-C, is entitled for further relaxation of credits in terms of Annexure-R1?"*

7. It is no doubt true that Annexure-C dated 01.09.2026 was introduced as a one time measure and in

terms of which, those students who were outside the purview of the policy at Annexure-R1 were extended certain benefits. The policy at Annexure-C is dated 01.09.2026, which was subsequent to the policy at Annexure-R1 is dated 19.08.2026.

8. The applicability of relaxation policy at Annexure-R1 was only insofar as such of students who had shortfall of four credits i.e., those who have credits between 36 to 40. Insofar as such of the students who had lesser credits, Annexure-C was inapplicable. By virtue of the policy at Annexure-R1, those students who had credits between 36 to 40, they were promoted to the next year without any further taking up of examination, as a one time relaxation. Insofar as other students are concerned who had credits lesser than 36, as the benefit of Annexure-R1 was not applicable to such of the students, one time measure by way of policy at Annexure-C was sought to be extended. In terms of the said policy, the petitioner attempted the examination and improved his

academic performance. However, in terms of the credits available, his credit stood at 36 even after the additional attempt at Annexure-C.

9. In terms of Annexure-C, it was contended by Sri.Somashekar, learned counsel appearing for the University that there was no provision for waiver of credit requirement and if that were to be so, petitioner were to obtain 40 credits in order to be promoted for the next Academic Year.

10. After having carefully perused Annexure-R1 as well as policy at Annexure-C, it is made out that Annexure-R1 relates to those students whose credits was between 36 to 40 who would be entitled to progress in terms of Exhibit R1 as a one-time relaxation. Insofar as Annexure-C, no doubt the policy stipulates that the student is required to have the credits required under normal circumstance for the purpose of progression. However, what could not be lost sight of was Annexure-R1

was dated 19.08.2026 while Annexure-C was dated 01.09.2026. Both Annexure-R1 and Annexure-C relate to the same year. The policy at Annexure-C being availed by the petitioner and after having availed of such opportunity, the petitioner's credit stands at 36.

11. No doubt the University has contended that in light of absence of relaxation of credit, the credits standing at 36 would not enable the petitioner for further progression. However, looking into the objective of affording one-time opportunity in terms of Annexure-R1, which was about 11 days prior to Annexure-C, once the petitioner had availed Annexure-C, the extension of benefit of Annexure-R1 would result in an harmonious interpretation of Annexure-R1 and Annexure-C. The benefit extended to students under Annexure-R1 also requires to be extended to those who have attempted the examination as per opportunity under Annexure-C.

12. It is also noticed that the relaxation at Annexure-R1 was only for the particular year. Similarly, insofar as such of the students who fell outside the purview of Annexure-R1 of the same year, the benefit at Annexure-C was offered. If that were to be so, Annexure-C and Annexure-R1 being limited only to the particular batch in question, the extension of benefit of Annexure-R1 even to those who had attempted the one-time examination at Annexure-C would be a beneficial harmonization of the policy of one-time opportunity at Annexure-C and Annexure-R1. Such interpretation is taken, taking note that Annexure-R1 and Annexure-C are particular to the present year alone and hence could not be used as a precedent for students other than those to whom Annexure-R1 and Annexure-C is applicable. Accordingly, the respondent to extend the benefit of Annexure-R1 to the petitioner as well.

13. Insofar as the issue of attendance is concerned, learned counsel appearing to the University has relied on

the lack of attendance stating that the III semester had commenced on 03.08.2026 and concludes on 20.11.2026. No doubt the petition itself was filed on 14.10.2026. However, where the schemes are offered as a one-time measure, interpretation of which was open till this court has passed an order on this day as the court is passing an order in favour of extending benefit to the student, the benefit granted by allowing the writ petition cannot be restricted as an illusory relief.

14. As matter was pending before this court and has taken time till the court has decided, it would be appropriate in the peculiar facts of this case that University advise appropriate measure so as not to prejudice the petitioner in continuing his III Semester only on the ground of attendance. It is open for the University either to direct the petitioner to take extra Classes or extra assignments and any costs incurred in this regard is required to be borne by the student so as to make good lack of attendance. The manner of implementation of such

arrangement is left open to the University while emphasising that admission to III Semester is not to be defeated.

15. Accordingly, the petition stands disposed of in terms of the above observations. The petitioner is permitted to resume classes for the III Semester forthwith. As regards the attendance, the University is at liberty to devise appropriate manner so as not to prejudice the petitioner in continuing his III Semester only on the ground of attendance. All contentions are kept open.

Sd/-
(S SUNIL DUTT YADAV)
JUDGE

NP