

2026:PHHC:078373-DB

**DR PAWANEET GILL****V/S****STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS**

Present: Mr. Vivek Sethi, Advocate
or the review applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl., AG, Haryana.

This application under Order XLVII Rule 1 read with Section 114 CPC has been filed on behalf of the review applicant-petitioner seeking review of the order dated 08.04.2026 passed in CWP No.10693 of 2026.

2. This petition was dismissed on 08.04.2026 by observing as under:-

“1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner who is an in-service doctor. She seeks admission in a postgraduate medical course as an NRI candidate. Her grievance is that the fee is not being accepted from her brother, who is based in Australia.

2. An objection has been raised by the respondents to the writ petition on the ground that the petitioner herself is a doctor and is employed, as such, she cannot claim to be dependent on or sponsored by anyone.

3. We find substance in the objection raised by the respondents, inasmuch as the benefit of the NRI category can be extended only to a candidate who is dependent on or sponsored by an NRI. A doctor who is already employed and receiving a salary cannot claim to be dependent on an NRI. We are at a loss to understand how the benefit of the NRI quota can be extended to in-service doctors. The petitioner is self-dependent and

therefore cannot claim the benefit of sponsorship from an NRI. The grievance in this regard is wholly misplaced.

4. *The respondents are also directed to revisit the policy to the extent it contemplates grant of admission under the NRI quota to in-service doctors.*

5. ***Dismissed*** in above terms.

6. *All pending miscellaneous applications, if any, also stand disposed of.”*

3. An application has now been filed by the review applicant-petitioner annexing the policy of the State contained in the Notice dated 14.01.2026, as per which a candidate is to be treated as an NRI for the purpose of grant of admission.

4. It is submitted that, even in the in-service candidate category, sponsorship is permissible.

5. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer made in the instant review application.

6. The admission to the NRI category is regulated by Clause 13 of the policy relied upon by the review applicant-petitioner. Clause 13(d) of the policy reads as under:-

“Such person should have looked after such student as the guardian of the student and evidence to that effect must have been produced before the committee by such person.”

7. If a person is self-employed, it would be difficult for him/her to state that he/she is a student under the guardianship of an NRI who is looking after such student claiming admission in the NRI category.

8. Even otherwise, we find that the last date for deposit of the fee was 19.02.2026, whereas the review applicant-petitioner approached this Court by filing the writ petition on 05.04.2026, which was much beyond the period prescribed for deposit of the admission fee.

9. In such circumstances, we are not inclined to go into any other aspect of the matter and, consequently, the instant review application filed by the review applicant-petitioner is ***dismissed***.

10. All pending applications shall also stand disposed of.

**[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE**

**[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE**

MAY 19, 2026
Rahul Joshi