IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.5843 of 2026

Decided on: 24.04.2026

Aakash Ojha **.....Petitioner**

Versus

Chaudhary Sarwan Kumar Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya **.....Respondent**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the Petitioner: Mr. Arun Rana and Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, Advocates.

For the Respondent: Mr. Prince Chauhan, Advocate.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. Prince Chauhan, learned Counsel, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of respondent.

2. With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, matter has been heard at this stage without calling reply from the respondent.

3. The case set up by the petitioner is that:-

3(i). The petitioner applied online on 05.12.2023 for admission in Ph.D course in the stream of Agronomy in the respondent- University.

---

[1]Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.

3(ii). In terms of Clause 5.0 of the applicable ICAR brochure “the ICAR quota seats remaining vacant after final online counseling automatically stand released to the concerned Agricultural University for filling up at its level as per the procedure invoked at the respondent-University. These seats will no more be called as ICAR seats and treated as University Seats.”

3(iii). During the counseling, the petitioner was admitted in the respondent-University in Ph.D course of Agronomy but against a Self-Finance Seat (SFS).

3(iv). It is the case set up by the petitioner that subsequently, a seat in the regular/ subsidized category became vacant on account of an ICAR- nominated candidate leaving the seat on 12.02.2024.

3(v). On regular/ subsidized seat became available, petitioner preferred a representation to the respondent-University on 14.02.2024 for converting his admission from Self-Finance Category to General/regular subsidized category.

The above was not accepted by the respondent. Petitioner’s representation was rejected on 14.11.2025, hence, this petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the petitioner for conversion of the seat from Self- Finance Category to General/ regular subsidized category is covered in terms of ***Sugandha Chauhan and others versus Chaudhary Sarwan Kumar Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya and others***[2] which inter alia based upon ***Sanchit Sahu versus CSKHPKV***.[3]

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that while considering the case of the petitioner for conversion of the seat from Self-Finance Category to General/regular subsidized category, the respondent did not keep in view aforesaid decisions.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner would be content in case the respondent is directed to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in accordance with law in view of aforesaid decisions within a fixed-time schedule. Learned counsel for the respondent is not averse to this prayer.

5. Having regard to the afore-submissions, but without examining the merits of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent to consider and decide the case of the petitioner afresh

---

[2]CWP No.2258/2023, decided on 27.12.2024.
[3]CWP No.1550/20923, decided on 10.04.2023.

notwithstanding Annexure P-6 dated 14.11.2025, for conversion of his seat from Self-Finance Category to General/regular subsidized category keeping in view the decisions in the cases of ***Sugandha Chauhan***[2] & ***Sanchit Sahu***[3] within a period of four weeks from today. The decision so arrived at shall also be communicated to the petitioner.

The writ petition stands disposed of in the above terms, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

April 24, 2026
yogesh