



\$~66

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 205/2026 & CM APPL. 940/2026, CM APPL. 9117/2026**
ANKIT YADAVPetitioner

Through: Ms. Nikita Capoor, Mr. Gaurav
Singh, Mr. Nitin Sansanwal, Advs.

versus

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITYRespondent
Through: Mr. Karan Prakash, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

%

11.03.2026

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

“A. Issue a Writ or order or direction in the nature of Mandamus to Respondent for quashing the arbitrary and illegal communication dated 19.12.2025 issued by Respondent, whereby the Petitioner’s Ph.D. registration has been denied, being arbitrary, non-speaking and violative of principles of natural justice and;

B. Issue a Writ or order or direction in the nature of Mandamus to Respondent to consider the Petitioner’s candidature in accordance with law...”

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner submitted his online application on 05.07.2025 for admission to Ph.D. programmes in Studies in Science Policy under UGC-NET JRF category.
3. The petitioner was called for viva-voce vide communication dated 08.08.2025 and he appeared before the Selection Committee on



13.08.2025. Thereafter, the respondent published the first merit list, and the petitioner was selected on merit with Rank 1 in the OBC category and a provisional offer of admission was issued to the petitioner on 01.09.2025.

4. On the date of document verification, the petitioner was unable to submit result/ provisional marksheet as the parent university namely, Kurukshetra University, had not issued the same.
5. Accordingly, on 07.09.2025, the petitioner submitted a detailed representation of time seeking extension of time upto 10.10.2025 for submission of the said documents.
6. The petitioner obtained the provisional marksheet from Kurukshetra University in September, 2025 but the said marskheet showed that the petitioner had failed in one subject out of 5 subjects. Hence, the petitioner was ineligible to continue with his PhD programme.
7. However, the petitioner being sure that there was some confusion in his evaluation, applied for re-evaluation and subsequently was declared pass and marskheets were issued.
8. Subsequently, the petitioner submitted the marksheet beyond 10.10.2025. Hence, the matter was placed before the advisory committee for admissions of the respondent, which rejected the request of the petitioner.
9. Hence, the present petition has been filed.
10. The respondent has filed a counter affidavit, however the same is not on record.
11. However, the soft copy has been shown to me in the Court today.
12. A perusal of the counter affidavit indicates that the sole ground taken



by the respondent is that the petitioner failed to submit the requisite documents within the deadline of 10.10.2025 as prescribed in the revised schedule for the PhD Programme for the academic year 2025-26, and therefore the rejection of the petitioner's admission is in accordance with the applicable guidelines.

13. In the present case, the facts noted above demonstrate that although the petitioner obtained the provisional marksheet in September 2025, the same erroneously reflected that the petitioner had failed in one subject. Subsequently, upon re-evaluation, the petitioner was declared to have passed all the subjects and the revised marksheet was issued on 03.12.2025. The effect of the revised marksheet would necessarily relate back to the date when the original result was declared. Thus, in September 2025 itself, the petitioner had in fact cleared his Master's examination and was otherwise eligible to continue with the PhD programme.
14. The petitioner's academic career cannot be jeopardised for no fault attributable to him. The delay in submission of the correct marksheet occurred solely due to the error in evaluation by Kurukshetra University and the time consumed in the re-evaluation process undertaken to rectify the said mistake. The petitioner acted diligently by promptly applying for re-evaluation upon noticing the discrepancy in his marksheet. Once the revised result confirmed that the petitioner had in fact passed all the subjects, it would be manifestly unjust to deny him the benefit of continuation in the PhD programme merely on account of a delay that was beyond his control.
15. A candidate should not be made to suffer adverse consequences due to



an error or administrative lapse on the part of the examining authority. Denial of admission in such circumstances would cause serious and irreparable prejudice to the petitioner's academic career.

16. For the said reasons, the petition is allowed and the rejection order dated 19.12.2025 is set aside.
17. The petitioner will be entitled to attend his classes. Since the petitioner's admission is being regularised and the order dated 19.12.2025 is set aside, the consequential benefits will ensue including permitting the petitioner to take re-exams in accordance with the respondent's extant regulations.
18. The petition is disposed of in aforesaid terms.
19. The counter affidavit handed over in court today is taken on record.

JASMEET SINGH, J

MARCH 11, 2026/sp