



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-1186-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 19.02.2026

Hardik Nanda

....Petitioner

Versus

Panjab University and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Jattana, Advocate, and
Mr. Mandeep Singh Gill, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate,
for the respondent-University.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1) The petitioner, who is a student of B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 Years Integrated Course of the respondent-University, is compelled to beseech indulgence of this Court, against the order dated 30.12.2025 (Annexure P-7), vide which, his request for restoration of admission, and to take examinations of 3rd semester was not acceded to, in the light of Rule 16 of the Handbook of Information, 2025.

2) Since the facts of the present case would have a decisive bearing upon evaluation of the legality of the impugned order, it would be essential to have a brief and comprehend narration thereof.

3) The petitioner secured admission in the B.A/B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 Years Integrated Course with the respondent University, during the Session 2024-25. Accordingly, he appeared in the first semester examinations, but out of six, he could clear only two examinations.



However, in sync with the relevant conditions/rules, the petitioner was promoted to the next semester, which commenced from January, 2025. Thereafter, he took examinations for the second semester, which were scheduled in the month of May/June, 2025. The result was declared on 12.09.2025, per which, he cleared only three examinations. Pertinently, for getting promotion to the third semester (2nd year), he was required to clear, at least, 50% of the examinations of the previous semesters. Though, as reflected above, the petitioner could not make out to reach the benchmark, but he was provisionally allowed to attend the classes of the third semester which commenced, w.e.f. 11.07.2025. As a consequence, he proceeded to attend classes from 21.07.2025 till 20.09.2025. However, when the result of second semester was declared on 12.09.2025, the authorities detained him from attending further classes of the said semester. Thereupon, without wasting much time, the petitioner on 13.09.2025, applied for re-evaluation, which resulted in his favour and he was declared pass in one more examination. However, the result of the re-evaluation was declared on 21.09.2025, but in a confidential manner. Since the result was not made accessible to the petitioner till 21.12.2025, he was not allowed to appear in the third semester examinations, which were slated w.e.f. 28.11.2025 till 24.12.2025.

4) On the basis of the abovesaid chronology of the events, learned counsel for the petitioner has advanced the following three fold arguments:-

- 1) Had the result of re-evaluation been declared/made accessible in time, the petitioner would have been able to continue the classes of third semester, and would also have



taken the examinations, which were held in the month of November/December, 2025.

2) Had the respondent-University evaluated the answer books correctly, at the first instance itself, the petitioner would not have to suffer. Therefore, apparently, the respondent-University is at fault. Reliance in this regard is placed upon an order dated 30.01.2025, rendered by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in **CWP-2074-2025 (Gursimran Singh Vs. Panjab University and others)**; and

3) Albeit, the respondent-University has not declined the request of the petitioner on account of shortage of lectures, still it is expedient to bring to the notice of this Court that since he attended classes from 21.07.2025 till 20.09.2025, for third semester, and being an active participant in the Legal Aid Society & Clinic of the UILS, he is entitled to seek condonation in lectures. Therefore, he has also crossed the barrier of shortage of lectures, if any. Needless to mention that, such a concession has already been extended to other students.

5) In the abovesaid position, he submits that since the third semester, as demonstrated above, is already over, therefore, the only relief which the petitioner is praying for, at this stage, is promotion to fourth semester, which is already is session w.e.f. 07.01.2026. And, he would take the examinations qua third semester at the time of supplementary/re-appear examinations, which are conducted by the University in odd and even sequence of the semesters.



6) On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent-University submits that since the petitioner could not achieve the benchmark of overall 70% attendance, and 65% per subject, he is not entitled to appear in the third semester supplementary examinations. All in all, the petitioner ought to have again enrolled for the third semester, and, in any case, he cannot be promoted to 4th semester, as per the relevant Rules.

7) Having heard learned counsel for the parties, and perused the paper book, this Court is of the considered view that the impugned order, indeed, is preposterous, and thus, warrants interference by this Court.

8) It is a matter of record that the petitioner, immediately after declaration of result of the second semester, i.e. on 12.09.2025, had applied for re-evaluation on 13.09.2025. Admittedly, it was the respondent-University, which did not declare the result till 21.12.2025, for the reasons best known to it. Further, even upon submitting excess fee by the petitioner, the result was declared, but in a confidential manner. At that stage, it came to light that petitioner had already cleared one more examination, and thus, he was eligible for attending and taking examinations of the third semester. Unfortunately, owing to the delay in making the result of re-evaluation available to the petitioner, which, in no uncertain terms, attributes to the respondent-University, he was deprived from appearing in third semester examinations. So much so, as informed, he was also detained to attend the lectures. In this view of the matter, the respondent-University cannot be allowed to derive any benefit of its own wrong, and play with the future of the student.



9) At this juncture, before heading towards the conclusion of the foregoing deliberations, it is essential to take note of the relevant observations recorded in **Gursimran Singh (supra):-**

“4. Learned counsel for the respondent-University submits that once, the candidate has not attended the minimum lectures, he cannot be allowed to appear in the 3rd semester examination hence, even if the petitioner deposits the fees of the 3rd semester, his prayer for appearing in the 3rd semester examination may kindly be declined.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the records of the present case with their able assistance.

6. From the pleadings recorded hereinbefore, it is clear that the responsibility of non-clearing of the required 50% examination so as to be promoted to the 3rd semester rests upon the respondent-University only. Had the respondent-University evaluated the answersheets of the petitioner correctly at the initial stage itself, the petitioner would have cleared more than 50% of the examination papers so as to be promoted to the 3rd semester, which benefit has gone to the favour of the petitioner after re-evaluation of his answersheets.

7. Keeping in view the fact that the non-promotion of the petitioner to the 3rd semester is only due to an act on the part of the respondent-University, no further prejudice can be caused to the petitioner so as to deny him for appearing in the 3rd semester examination, then he will loose a year without any fault of his.

8. Once, the respondent-University did not allowed the petitioner to be promoted to the 3rd semester and to attend the classes due to incorrect result, which has now been rectified, in case now the University is allowed to take the said objection even to deny the petitioner from appearing in 3rd semester examination will be putting premium on the illegal act on the part of the respondent-University. The petitioner cannot be caused any further prejudice. Though, the petitioner might not



have studied in the 3rd semester classes but in case, he is capable of clearing the 3rd semester examination, a chance should be given to him and no practical study was required to be undertaken in 3rd semester and same is only academic.”

10) As a sequel, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**, with the following directions:-

- 1) The petitioner shall be admitted to the fourth semester, which, as stated above, is already in progress, w.e.f. 27.01.2026;
- 2) He shall be permitted to take examinations of third semester in the supplementary examinations, by granting the benefit of condonation of shortage of lectures, in view of the petitioner’s participation in Legal Aid Society & Clinic of the UIILS;
- 3) The respondent-University shall also adjust the fee, if any, deposited by the petitioner for the third semester; and
- 4) The respondent-University shall act upon the abovesaid stipulations, within a week from the receipt of a certified copy of this order, subject to completion of formalities and submission of documents, if any, by the petitioner.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

19.02.2026
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No