



2026:UHC:1679

**HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT**

**NAINITAL**

**Writ Petition Misc. Single No.3672 of 2025**

**12<sup>th</sup> March, 2026**

Susana Methodist Girls B.ed. College .....Petitioner

**Versus**

Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna  
Garhwal University Srinagar .....Respondent

-----  
Presence:-

Mr. A.S. Rawat, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Gaurav Paliwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Dr. Kartikey Hari Gupta, Advocate for the respondent.  
-----

With

**Writ Petition Misc. Single No.3685 of 2025**

Arihant Education Society .....Petitioner

**Versus**

Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna  
Garhwal University Srinagar .....Respondent

-----  
Presence:-

Mr. Sanpreet Singh Ajmani, learned counsel holding brief of Mr. Narendra Bali, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Dr. Kartikey Hari Gupta, Advocate for the respondent.  
-----

**Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.**

Since both the writ petitions have the common facts and law involved, therefore, are being decided by this common judgment and order finally with the consent of the parties.

2. For the sake of convenience the facts of WPMS No.3672 of 2025 are only being considered.



3. This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner-College for quashing the letter/communication dated 25.11.2025, annexure no.11, and other letter /communication dated 17.12.2025 issued by the respondent-University whereby it has been informed to the petitioner-College that respondent-University does not have provision for calling a supervisory for the approval committee for completing the admission process and the admission made through any other means will not be permitted and the respondent-University cannot conduct examination of such students who were given admission in violation of Rules and procedure by the petitioner-College.

4. The facts of the case, in brief, are that the petitioner-College is an unaided minority college which imparts a two-year B.Ed. degree to girls. It is undisputed that the petitioner-College has been granted approval to induct 100 students in the two-year B.Ed. course.

5. As per the norms canvassed by the counsel appearing for the respondent-University, after the year 2023 admissions to the College were required to be made from the result of the Entrance Test conducted by the University, namely the University Entrance Test (U.E.T.).

6. However, the petitioner-College gave admission to all 100 students without adhering to the norms of the respondent-University, wherein candidates were required to qualify the said Entrance Test. The petitioner-College, however, claimed that it had conducted its own test of the students and that admissions were granted only after the students had qualified such test for the two-year B.Ed. course for the Academic Session 2025-27.

7. Thereafter, the petitioner-College approached the



respondent-University requesting it to conduct the examination for the students who had been admitted by the petitioner-College on its own. The petitioner-College also filed an affidavit/undertaking earlier before the respondent-University stating that, as a last measure, permission be granted to allow the students to appear in the examination as a one-time relaxation. The petitioner-College further undertook that in future such admissions would not be granted in violation of the prescribed procedure and that for the Academic Session 2025-27 it would adopt the admission procedure followed by the respondent-University and its affiliated colleges.

8. The petitioner-College also made a representation to the Registrar of the respondent-University and sent various letters requesting permission for its students to appear in the examination conducted by the respondent-University. A further representation was submitted to the Registrar of the respondent-University on 03.12.2025. However, the said request was rejected by the respondent-University vide the impugned order dated 17.12.2025.

9. Since the petitioner-College had violated the rules by inducting students without requiring them to qualify the U.E.T., the respondent-University decided not to conduct the examination for the students of the petitioner-College. Hence this writ petition.

10. Learned Senior Advocate for the petitioner-College vehemently argued that the petitioner-College itself conducted the test and it is only after conducting the entrance test the students were given admission in the petitioner-College for two years B.Ed. Course Academic Session 2025-27; however he admits that none of the



students had passed the entrance examination conducted by the University namely U.E.T.

11. Learned Senior Advocate for the petitioner-College submitted that it is only in the interest of the students who have given admission this Court should interfere in the matter under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. He further submits that he wants this year's accommodation and no further accommodation to such an act as committed by the petitioner-College.

12. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent-University submits that since the petitioner-College violated the rules of entrance examination in the B.Ed. Course which is conducted by the respondent-University as U.E.T., therefore the respondent-University is not in a position to accommodate even for this academic session. He further submits that earlier the petitioner-College was given accommodation by the respondent-University twice.

13. Having considered the rival submissions of the parties and having perused the averments made in the writ petition, this Court is of the view that only in the interest of the students and to save their academic career this Court is inclined to interfere in the matter, inasmuch as, permitting the petitioner-College to make a fresh representation to the respondent-University within a period of one week from today; if such a representation is moved by the petitioner-College to the respondent-University for seeking exemption only for the Academic Session 2025-27, the respondent-University shall decide it after giving a thoughtful consideration to the representation keeping in view the interest of the students and ignoring the earlier decision taken by the respondent-University.



2026:UHC:1679

14. Accordingly both the writ petitions stand disposed of with a direction that if such a representation is filed before the respondent-University, the respondent-University shall take a decision on the said representation within a week by a speaking order after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioners-Colleges.

**(Pankaj Purohit, J.)**  
**12.03.2026**

SK