



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

**CWP-32328-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:25.03.2026**

VINAY

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

DEENBANDHU CHHOTU RAM UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND
TECHNOLOGY MURTHAL AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENT(S)

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. Manoj Tanwar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anuj Dewan, Advocate
for respondents No.1 to 3.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. Replication not filed.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that he does not intend to file any replication and that the assertions made by the respondent-University in its reply be read as such.
3. The petitioner was pursuing his Ph.D. course. His admission stands cancelled *vide* impugned order dated 09.10.2025 by respondent No. 2 on the ground that the research plan has not been submitted within time.
4. In the present writ petition, it has been stated that two other similarly placed persons have been allowed extension of time to submit the research plan, but the petitioner has been discriminated against.

5. As per the respondents, the delay in submission of the research plan in the aforesaid cases had been condoned, whereas in the present case, the research plan itself has not been submitted.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has invited the attention of the Court to a report of an 11-member Committee constituted by the University itself on the representation submitted by the petitioner with regard to extension of time for pursuing the Ph.D. course. The Committee, in its report, has observed as under:-

“DRC is of the opinion that Mr. Vinay couldn't submit his presentation of synopsis well in time due to pending decision of change of his research supervisor. Now, JRF time period of Mr. Vinay has expired and he is not eligible for UGC scholarship as a fresh candidate, even if he qualify the PhD exam of any university and take readmission also, he will be losing his more than 3 years of research work that he carried out here in the department. During this time period, he has published 03 research papers in Scopus Indexed/SSCT ABDC list under the supervision of Dr. Pankaj Kumar, Associate Professor in the Department who gave his consent in October 2023 to be his new research supervisor.

Mr. Vinay research scholar belongs to a poor backward class family. He was managing his research work through JRF fellowship which is stopped for many months due to this issue. He is facing mental as well as financial problem. Cancelling of admission will aggravate his problems. Hence looking at the interest of the student and natural justice, the DRC request the authority that the case of Mr. Vinay may be presented before the highest academic body i.e. Academic Council of the university to decide the matter so that a fair

and justified decision may be taken.”

7. Notwithstanding the above report, the Academic Council of the University has cancelled the admission of the petitioner.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that his research plan is ready, but only because the earlier Guide was non-responsive/uncooperative and a change was made in the Guide, the research plan already prepared could not be submitted. It is contended that if the petitioner is given an opportunity of even two weeks, he would submit the research plan. The petitioner also undertakes to complete the Ph.D. course within the maximum time prescribed under the Ordinance.

9. Learned counsel for the University states that if the petitioner submits such an undertaking, the University would be willing to consider his request for continuation of the Ph.D. course, provided it is not treated as a precedent.

10. We find the stand of the University to be fair.

11. Considering the report of the Expert Committee, we are inclined to accept the petitioner's case, as per which an opportunity is required to be extended to him to continue with the Ph.D. course. In such circumstances, we ***dispose of*** this writ petition with the observation that in case, the petitioner undertakes to submit the research plan within two weeks and to complete the Ph.D. course within the maximum period prescribed, the University will reconsider its stand within *two months*.

12. In order to facilitate such fresh consideration of cause, the order impugned in the writ petition stands quashed.

13. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

MARCH 25, 2026
Rahul Joshi

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether Speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether Reportable | Yes/No |