127

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-8971-2026
Date of Decision : **24.03.2026**

JAYWARDHAN GAHLOT .....Petitioner

VERSUS

PANJAB UNIVERSITY & OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Tejinder Pal Singh Makkar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate,
for the respondents.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.

1. The petitioner is pursuing B.Com. LLB (Hon.) Five Years integrated course with respondent no.2-UILS, wherein he was admitted after having successfully cleared the competitive exam for admission and became a regular student since July, 2024 onwards.

2. By filing the instant petition, as cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner beseeches indulgence of this Court, for issuance of a *mandamus* upon respondent no.2-UILS, to allow him to continue his studies in 4th Semester, and to appear in the supplementary examination of 3rd Semester after condoning shortage of lectures.

3. Shorn of unnecessary details, the facts which are relevant for adjudication of the instant matter are that; the petitioner appeared in Ist

DINESH
2026.03.27 19:47
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

Semester examination, but only cleared three papers out of total six. Similarly, he could clear only one papers out of six in 2nd Semester. In order to get promotion in 3rd Semester, a student is required to complete at least 50% of the total papers. In the instant case, the petitioner was not able to clear 50% of total papers of Ist Semester, therefore, he was not entitled to promote in 2nd Semester. Here, it is important to note that the petitioner applied for re-evaluation of his answer-sheets of 2nd Semester examinations, however, the result of re-valuation was declared on 02.01.2026. As per re-evaluation, the petitioner was able to clear total three papers of 2nd Semester. Therefore, he completed 50% benchmark required him to be entitled for admission in 3rd Semester. The petitioner was allowed, provisionally, to appear in 3rd Semester, subject to fulfillment of requirement of 50% of the total papers, up to and including previous semester. The petitioner also deposited the examination fee for 3rd Semester on 17.09.2025. However, on account of pendency of re-evaluation result, he might not be allowed to appear in 3rd Semester examination.

4. The petitioner made a representation dated 08.01.2026 (Annexure P-7), seeking similar relief, as prayed for in the instant petition, has remained unanswered till date, which propelled the petitioner to file the instant writ petition.

5. On the basis of the above chronology of events, learned counsel for the petitioner, has advanced the following arguments:-

1) Had the result of re-evaluation been declared/made

DINESH
2026.03.27 19:47
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

accessible in time, the petitioner would have been able to continue the classes of 3rd semester, and would also have taken the 3rd semester examinations, which were held in the month of November/December, 2025.

2) Had the respondent no.2-UILS, evaluated the answer-sheet correctly, at the first instance itself, the petitioner would not have to suffer. Therefore, apparently, the respondent no.2-UILS, 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);

3) The petitioner was a part of the Committee, especially, the ADR Board, where he alongwith other senior students, being part of the Committee, had been carrying out workshops, especially in the slum areas, and the areas, where the people with less resources resides, to advise them with regard to their rights as well as the manner in which the ADR could be obtained as a matter of right, therefore, the petitioner is entitled to receive relaxation in lectures.

6. He, further submits that all the above issues, as raised by the petitioner, are required to be considered by respondent no.2-UILS, which have not been considered.

DINESH
2026.03.27 19:47
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

7. He also placed reliance upon a judgement passed by this Court "**Hardik Nanda vs. Panjab University and others**" (CWP-1186-2026, decided on 19.02.2026) (Annexure P-8), wherein a similar issue had cropped up, and the petitioner therein was granted the relief of being admitted in 4th Semester. The permission was also granted to take examinations of 3rd Semester in supplementary examination, by giving the benefit of condonation of shortage of lectures, in view of the fact that the petitioner therein, participated in Legal-Aid Society & Clinic of the UILS.

8. On an advance notice, Mr. Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate, has caused appearance on behalf of respondents. He, on instructions, fairly concedes that the case of the petitioner is required to be considered in view of the judgement (*supra*).

9. This Court has considered the rival submissions, and is of the view that the representation dated 08.01.2026, which is pending before respondent no.2-UILS, is required to be considered, at first instance, specifically, in view of the judgment (*supra*).

10. Since the academic career of the petitioner is at stake, therefore, a *mandamus* is passed upon respondent no.2-UILS to decide the representation (*supra*), within a period of 10 days from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

11. **Dispose of** accordingly.

A copy of this order be handed over to learned counsels for

DINESH
2026.03.27 19:47
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

the petitioner and respondents, under the signature of the Special Secretary (Reader line) of this Court.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

March 24, 2026
dharamvir

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No

DINESH
2026.03.27 19:47
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document