



\$~70

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 1403/2026**

SHRI DHARMADEV PUHAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sushant Mahapatra, Ms. Shivangi
Banerjee and Ms. Shubhangi Jain,
Advs

versus

PHARMACY COUNCIL OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, Mr.
Yatharth Singh, Mr. Divyansh Singh,
Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

% **02.02.2026**

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:-

“1. direct the Respondent No.1 (PCI) to issue an elaborate, noncryptic and speaking order clarifying that Regulation 26 of the M. Pharma Course Regulations, 2014 as per their stand taken earlier in response to Respondent No.2's communications is the relevant regulation applicable in the present matter to allow re-admission of the Petitioner;

2. issue direction to Respondent No.2 that once such a clear indication is received from the Respondent No.1, the University shall permit said re-admission and issue clear instructions to Respondent No.3 for the same;

3. issue directions to Respondent No.3 to further admit the



Petitioner on the basis of condonation fees already paid on 01.12.2023 and other relevant formalities done by the Petitioner for the completion of his degree;

4. Pass any other and further order as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case."

2. For the reasons stated in the petition, issue notice.
3. Mr. Singh, learned standing counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent No.1.
4. The only reason the present petition has been filed in Delhi is because of Pharmacy Council of India i.e., respondent No. 1, is situated at New Delhi.
5. Mr. Singh, learned standing counsel for the respondent No.1, states that in the present case, the dispute is between the petitioner and respondent Nos. 2 and 3.
6. Pharmacy Council of India/respondent No.1 has already clarified its stand in the e-mail annexed at "Annexure P/10" with the present petition to state that the petitioner is entitled to re-admission of the programme after break of study, after paying the condonation fee.
7. Since the said condonation fee has been paid, the respondent No. 1 has already clarified its stand and the dispute, if any, is between petitioner and respondent Nos. 2 and 3.
8. In this view of the statement of Mr. Singh, learned standing counsel for the respondent No.1, learned counsel for the petitioner does not press the present petition.
9. However, if there any surviving grievances, petitioner is at liberty to approach the competent Court.



10. Grating the said liberty, the present petition is disposed of in aforesaid terms.

JASMEET SINGH, J

FEBRUARY 2, 2026/rr