

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA****CWP No.2881 of 2026****Decided on: 19<sup>th</sup> March, 2026**-----  
Tarun Goyal**.....Petitioner****Versus**

State of H.P. and others

**.....Respondents**  
-----**Coram****Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua****Whether approved for reporting?<sup>1</sup>**

For the Petitioner: Mr. Arun Kumar, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Y.P.S. Dhaulta, Additional Advocate  
General, for respondent No.1.

None for respondent No.2.

Ms. Kanta Thakur, Advocate, for  
respondent No.3.  
-----**Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge**

The case set up by the petitioner is that he took admission in LLB three years Degree course in the year 2015 in respondent No.3-University. He appeared in all six semester examinations for the course in question. Detailed Marks Cards for all the six semesters were issued to him. He cleared LLB Degree course in the year 2018. Provisional Degree was awarded to him on 17.09.2018. Petitioner thereafter enrolled himself under the Advocates Act with

---

<sup>1</sup>Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.



Bar Council of Delhi on the basis of Detailed Marks Cards as also the provisional degree issued by respondent No.3. He also appeared in the exam conducted by the Bar Council of India and was declared successful. Petitioner required his final Degree of LLB examination. He requested respondent No.3 on 30.04.2025 for releasing the same. Despite repeated representations of the petitioner, written and oral, final degree of LLB course was not issued to him. Based upon the verification report dated 08.05.2025, the petitioner was apprised by the respondents that: (i) Though his name appears in the green sheet register, but not in the approved list and admission disclosure list for the year 2015; Instead of petitioner's name, name of one Abhinaw Kumar has been reflected under petitioner's roll number; and (ii) Though the petitioner has been issued Detailed Marks Cards for all the six semesters, but there is mismatch in the record of first semester examination; As per Gazette, petitioner is shown to have scored 303/500 marks, whereas the entry made on green sheet reflects the same to be 311/500.

In the above background, the petitioner has preferred this writ petition seeking directions to the respondents to correct the marks of his first semester examination, i.e. 303/500 instead of 311/500 and to issue



him corrected provisional certificate as also the LLB Degree in accordance with law.

2. This case was taken up on 12.03.2026, when learned counsel for the petitioner stated that the issue involved in the case is covered by the decision rendered in ***Pratima Das Versus State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.***<sup>2</sup>. In *Pratima Das*<sup>2</sup>, the petitioner therein was found to be enrolled in the green register, but her name was not reflected in the admission disclosure list. Instead, name of another person had been mentioned against the admission number assigned to Pratima Das. Respondent No.3- University acknowledged the mistake at its end while preparing the admission disclosure list, wherein, name of Pratima Das had not been mentioned. The Special Leave Petition was, therefore, decided as under:-

*“20. From the above affidavit and documents on record, it is undisputed that the Appellant has been a bona fide student of MB University and had cleared all her examinations. It is also evident that the exclusion of the name of the Appellant in the admission disclosure list has occurred due to no fault on part of the Appellant, rather the same is at the hands of the University for which the Appellant cannot be made to suffer.*

*21. Having regard to the above established facts based on records, we are of the view that the Appellant has been deprived of her documents for no fault of hers for a substantial period of time and relegating her to another court of competent jurisdiction as observed by the High Court vide the impugned order dated 20.12.2024 would no more be required as there is no factual dispute left.*

---

<sup>2</sup> SLP (Civil) No.15180 of 2025, decided on 06.01.2026



22. *In view of the above, the appeal is allowed and MB University is directed to issue the marksheets of 5<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> semester, the degree and any other relevant documents, if any, to the Appellant within four weeks from today.”*

In view of above decision, respondent No.3 was directed vide order dated 12.03.2026 to have instructions as to whether the case of the present petitioner is also covered by *Pratima Das*<sup>2</sup>.

3. Learned counsel for respondent No.3, on the basis of instructions imparted to her, submits that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered in terms of *Pratima Das*<sup>2</sup>. That the petitioner was a *bonafide* student of respondent No.3-University and had cleared his examination. That due to a clerical error, petitioner’s name was not included in the admission disclosure list sent to HPPERC. It was, however, pointed out that since there is a mismatch in the marks of the petitioner reflected in the Gazette vis-à-vis marks appearing on the green sheet, therefore, the petitioner would have to move appropriate application before the learned Trial Court in terms of the directions issued in ***Priya Thakur Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others***<sup>3</sup>, whereunder, in similar circumstances, petitioner therein was permitted to move appropriate application before the learned Trial Court,

---

<sup>3</sup> CWP No.2690 of 2024, decided on 22.04.2025



where the marks-sheet in original stood deposited and on receipt of such application, learned Trial Court was to pass appropriate orders. Relevant portion from the said decision reads as under:-

- “5. In the light of the fact that the relevant correction, if ordered, has to be carried out in the original record, which is presently lying with the learned Trial Court, this Court is of the considered view that it would be in the interest of justice, in case, the petitioner is granted permission to move an application to this effect before the learned Trial Court, which in the light of the contents of the application, may pass appropriate order thereupon.*
- 6. Ms. Tanu Sharma, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2, has also apprised the Court that as far as the role of respondent No.2 in this writ petition is concerned, it is very limited. Once the Degree of the petitioner is verified by the University concerned, it is only thereafter that the petitioner can approach respondent No.2 for her registration and the registration will be if the petitioner satisfies the statutory provisions of the Act concerned.*
- 7. In the light of the above observations, this writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to move an appropriate application before the learned Trial Court where the mark-sheets in original stand deposited and on the receipt of any such application, let the learned Trial Court pass appropriate order thereupon. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.”*

**4.** In view of above and taking note of the submissions advanced by learned counsel for respondent No.3 that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered in terms of *Pratima Das*<sup>2</sup>, but for the mismatch figuring in the result of his first semester examination, this writ petition is disposed of with liberty reserved to the petitioner to move



appropriate application before the learned Trial Court, where marks-sheets in original are lying deposited. In case of moving of such application, learned Trial Court concerned shall pass appropriate orders thereupon.

The writ petition stands disposed of in the above terms, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

March 19, 2026  
*Mukesh*

Jyotsna Rewal Dua  
Judge