



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

\*\*\*

**140**

**CWP-17743-1998 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 12.03.2026**

**NAVEEN SANGHI AND OTHERS**

...Petitioners

Versus

**PUNJABI UNIVERSITY PATIALA THROUGH ITS REGISTRAR  
AND OTHERS**

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present:- Mr. Naveen Sanghi, petitioner No.1 in person  
(through V.C.)

Mr. Veer Singh, Advocate  
for petitioner Nos.2 & 4

Mr. Divyansh Vats, Advocate on behalf of  
Mr. Harchand Singh Batth, Advocate  
For respondents

\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to respondent to direct University to issue Medal for having stood 'first class first' in the Bachelor of Law (Professional) Degree examination held in April' 1997.

2. Mr. Veer Singh, Advocate has appeared and filed memorandum of appearance on behalf of petitioner No.2 and vakalatnama on behalf of petitioner No.4. The same are taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

3. On the 03.04.2025, the following order was passed:-

*"The petitioners approached this Court for issuance of mandamus upon the respondents to release University Medal to petitioner no. 1, for having stood 'first class first' in the Bachelor*



*of Law (Professional) Degree Examination held by the respondent University in April, 1997, and similarly, petitioners No. 1 to 4 for having earned 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> positions, respectively, in the order of merit in the merit list, in accordance with statutory scheme for the award of University Medal.*

*Petitioner No. 1, who has appeared in person, by drawing the attention of this Court towards para no. 7 of the writ petition, wherein, the apposite rule has been extracted, submitted that the LL.B. Course is not an integrated course, rather the degree has been given to the petitioners on the basis of marks obtained in Part-III only, and this aspect has been clearly admitted in the written statement submitted by the respondent-University in para no. 21(ii). The relevant rule is extracted hereinunder:-*

*"The following rules shall apply for the award of medals:*

- 1. University medals would be awarded only when atleast 10 candidates have appeared at the examination except in the case of M.A. Persian,*
- 2. No medal would be awarded on the basis of such diploma/ certificate course where the duration of the course is less than one year.*
- 3. (i) All awards shall be made on the result of the annual examination only. No award is to be made on the result of biannual or supplementary examination:*

*Provided that medals in the case of M.I.L. examinations shall be awarded to candidates securing first position on the combined result of both the examinations held during the year.*

*(i1) \* Only such candidates shall be entitled to the award as pass the examination at the first attempt. This condition shall, in the case of an examination for which the award is made on the combined basis of the result of the, examination for different parts of the course, apply separately to all such examinations of the course:*

*Provided that this shall not apply to first semester examination of Bachelor of Engineering.*



*Foot note: In preparation of merit lists such examinations shall be treated as integrated course as the degree/ division is awarded on the basis of aggregate marks of these examinations.”*

*Learned counsel for respondent-University, submitted that since the petitioners did not appear in one semester, therefore, they cannot claim the Medal, on account of attaining the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th positions, consecutively .*

*This Court has considered the submissions, and find that the stand of the University is not in consonance of the Rules (supra), therefore, at this stage, a direction is passed upon the University to reconsider the claim of the petitioners, and thereupon, file a status report before this Court, on one before the next date of hearing.*

*Adjourned to 15.5.2025.”*

4. Pursuant to aforesaid order, respondent has passed order dated 14.05.2025 whereby claim of petitioners has been rejected.
5. On being asked, learned counsel for the petitioner Nos.2 and 4 and petitioner No.1 who is present in person submit that it is factually correct that with the efflux of time, the prayer has rendered more academic than substantive.
6. In the wake of aforesaid statement and findings recorded in speaking order dated 14.05.2025, this Court does not find it appropriate to further dilate on the factual issues and contentions of the parties.
7. Disposed of .
8. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**12.03.2026**  
SDK

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |