

(2025) 03 UK CK 0859

In the Uttarakhand High Court

Case No : Writ Petition No. 748 Of 2025 (M/S)

Moin And Another

APPELLANT

Vs

Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal Central University And
Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 17-03-2025

Acts Referred:

Constitution Of India, 1950 — Article 226

Citation : (2025) 03 UK CK 0859

Hon'ble Judges : Alok Kumar Verma, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Shivam Sharma, Pawan Mishra, Dr. Kartikey Hari Gupta, Sandeep Tiwari

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Alok Kumar Verma,J

1. The present Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India with the following prayers: -

“(i) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari, calling for records and quashing the circular dated 18.10.2024 (Annexure No. 21) and 19.10.2024 (Annexure No.22) issued by Respondent No. 1.

(ii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3 for conducting the 1st Semester examination of petitioners for Session 2024-2025;

(iii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondent Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 to formulate a proper mechanism and time schedule for future University Entrance Examination (UET); and

(iv) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3 for making proper mechanism for conducting

Counseling of the students who are desirous of taking admission as per their choice in affiliated colleges,

(v) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 to formulate a proper time line and mechanism / rules for taking admission through University Entrance Test (UET) so as to avoid confusions in future, and

(vi) Pass any other and further orders, which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case."

2. Heard Mr. Shivam Sharma, learned counsel with Mr. Pawan Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioners, Dr. Kartikey Hari Gupta, learned counsel for the respondent nos.1 to 3 and Mr. Sandeep Tiwari, learned counsel for the respondent no.5.

3. Mr. Shivam Sharma, Advocate, on instructions from the petitioners, has requested to decide the present writ petition directing the respondent no.1 to decide the representation of the petitioners as expeditiously as possible and for this purpose, the petitioners shall move their representations within one week from today.

4. Dr. Kartikey Hari Gupta, Advocate, for the respondent no.1 has sought three weeks' time to decide the representation of the petitioners.

5. On the request of Mr. Shivam Sharma, Advocate and with the consent of Dr. Kartikey Hari Gupta, Advocate, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction that if the petitioners move their representation within one week from today, the respondent no.1 shall decide the said representation as expeditiously as possible but not later than three weeks thereafter, but, in accordance with law/ rules / regulations.

6. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merit of the case.