



2026:DHC:4512



\$~129 & 171

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

% **Date of Decision : 18.05.2026**

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 900/2026**

(129) INDU PRAKASH PHARMACY COLLEGE .....Petitioner  
Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat (Sr. Adv) along  
with Mr. Mayank Manish, Mr. Ravi  
Kant, Mr. Vineet Upadhyay, Mr.  
Ayush Aanand, Advs.

versus

MR. ANIL MITTAL, REGISTRAR-CUM MEMBER  
SECRETARY, PHARMACY COUNCIL OF INDIA AND ANR  
.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Chetanya Singh, Mr. Chetan  
Sharma, Advs.

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 904/2026**

(171) SRLT INSTITUTE OF PHARMACY AND MANAGEMENT  
.....Petitioner  
Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat (Sr. Adv) along  
with Mr. Mayank Manish, Mr. Ravi  
Kant, Mr. Vineet Upadhyay, Mr.  
Ayush Aanand, Advs.

versus

MR ANIL MITTAL AND ANR .....Respondents  
Through: Mr. Chetanya Singh, Mr. Chetan  
Sharma, Advs.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA**

**SACHIN DATTA, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present petitions have been filed by the petitioners alleging wilful disobedience/ non-compliance of the directions contained in the order dated 13.04.2026 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) 3166/2026 & other connected



matters. The operative directions therein are as under:-

20. A perusal of the aforesaid paragraphs shows that the State of Uttar Pradesh as well as the affiliating university have categorically stated that there is no requirement of a COA of the examining authority as well as an NOC of the State Government for grant/ extension of any course. That being position of the State of Uttar Pradesh as well as the affiliating university, the respondent insistence on providing the said documents by the petitioner institution is meaningless. The petitioner institution is incapable and is not in a position to provide these documents in view of a clear stand of the university as well as the State that the documents are not required as a pre-condition for grant of approval.

21. In this view of the matter and in view of the aforesaid factual position, the petition is allowed and the impugned decision dated 22.01.2026 is quashed. Thus, respondent is directed to process application of the petitioner institution without insisting on the requirement of the aforesaid two documents and in accordance with the timeline fixed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

2. Issue notice.
3. Learned counsel, as aforesaid, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.
4. After some hearing, learned counsel for the respondents assures and undertakes on instructions that the aforesaid directions shall be complied with and the necessary exercise shall be completed within a period of one week from today. The said statement and undertaking is taken on record. The respondent shall remain bound by the said undertaking.
5. The petition is disposed of in the above terms.
6. It is made clear that any breach of the aforesaid undertaking shall be construed as wilful disobedience of the orders passed by this Court entailing severe action under the Section 2(b) read with Section 12 of the Contempt of



2026:DHC:4512



Courts Act, 1971.

7. In case of any breach, the petitioner shall be at liberty to revive the present proceedings.

**SACHIN DATTA, J**

**MAY 18, 2026/uk**