



CR-2708-2026 (O&M)

-1-

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

CR-2708-2026 (O&M)**Reserved on : 25.03.2026****Date of Pronouncement : 27.03.2026****Date of Uploading : 01.04.2026**

Pt. Bhagwat Dayal Sharma University of Health Sciences, Rohtak and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Anu Yadav and others

.....Respondents

Whether only the operative part of the judgment is pronounced?

NO

Whether full judgment is pronounced?

YES

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present : Mr. S.K.Garg Narwana, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Harmanjot Singh Gill, Advocate,
Mr. Nitin Sachdeva, Advocate, and
Ms. Nancy Antwal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J.

1. The present revision petition has been filed for setting aside order dated 21.02.2026 passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Rohtak, whereby application moved by the petitioner under Order VII Rule 11 read with Section 151 CPC has been dismissed.
2. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioners contends that learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Rohtak, has wrongly dismissed the application filed by the petitioners under Order VII Rule 11 CPC without appreciating the fact that there is alternate remedy under Clause 8(3) of the



Ordinance of Maintenance of Discipline among Students available to the respondents to file appeal before the Vice Chancellor against the order dated 02.02.2026 passed by the Vice Chancellor. He therefore, prays that the present revision petition be allowed and order dated 21.02.2026 passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Rohtak, be set aside.

3. I have heard learned Senior counsel for the petitioners and perused the case file with his able assistance.

4. A perusal of the file shows that learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Rohtak, has rightly dismissed the application filed by the petitioner since as per Section 9 CPC, Civil Court has jurisdiction to try all civil suits of civil nature unless and until there is express or implied bar. Further as per the contentions of learned Senior counsel for the petitioners, with respect to availability of alternate remedy is concerned, the same cannot be the reason for rejection of the plaint filed by the respondents. Clause 8(3) of the Ordinance of Maintenance of Discipline among Students is the provision of appeal to the Vice Chancellor against the order, whereas, impugned order dated 02.02.2026, in the civil suit is passed by the Vice Chancellor himself. Therefore, appeal cannot be heard by the same person, who has passed the order himself.

5. In view of the above, I do not find any infirmity or illegality in the impugned order dated 21.02.2026 passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Rohtak, and the same does not warrant any interference by this



CR-2708-2026 (O&M)

-3-

Court. Consequently, the said impugned order dated 21.02.2026 is upheld and the present petition is hereby **dismissed**.

6. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

27.03.2026

Virender

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No