IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.1961 OF 2026

Gaurav Panditrao Aware
Age- 26 Yrs.
Occ. Education
R/o. Survey No. 63/1 + 63/2,
Plot No. 11, Vidya Nagar, Makwalabad Road,
Panchavati, Tal. and Dist. Nashik.

…Petitioner

Versus

1) The State of Maharashtra
(Through The Secretary, Education Dept.,
Mantralaya, Mumbai- 32).

2) The Controller of Examinations,
Savitribai Phule University, Ganesh Khind,
Pune-411 007.

3) The Director, Board of Examinations and
Evaluation Department, Savitribai Phule University,
Ganesh Khind, Pune- 411 007.

4) The Principal, Bhonsala Military College,
Ram Bhoomi, Nashik -422 005.

…Respondents

Mr. Sachin Kadam, for the Petitioner.
Mr. Rajendra Anbhule, for Respondent Nos. 2 and 3.
Mrs. Anjali Helekar a/w. Ms. Anu Kaladharan, for Respondent No.4.
Mr. V.G. Badgujar, AGP for the State.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.

RESERVED ON : 25th FEBRUARY, 2026
PRONOUNCED ON : 12th MARCH, 2026

JUDGMENT : (Per: ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

1. Heard. **Rule**. Rule is made returnable forthwith and heard finally with the consent of the learned counsel for the respective parties.

2. By this Petition, the Petitioner seeks a direction against Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 to forthwith revive/extend the Permanent Registration Number (for short, "***PRN***") No. 1012105550 allotted to him to pursue the Bachelor of Business Administration (for short, "***B.B.A.***") course and permit him to complete the pending practical examination and viva of two subjects, each of fifth and sixth semester viz. semester fifth- 515(C)- 'Cross cultural HR and Industrial Relations', 516(C)- 'Cases in Human Resource Management' and semester sixth- 615(C)- 'Global Human Resource Management' and 616(C)- 'Recent Trends and HR Accounting' of three year B.B.A. course for the academic year 2025-2026.

3. In July 2019, the Petitioner took admission in the first year for the B.B.A. course at Bhonsala Military College (for short, *"**College***"), affiliated to Savitribai Phule University, Pune (for short, the "***University***"). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Petitioner was unable to attend the said course and its examinations for the academic years 2019-2020 and

2020-2021. In 2022, he attended college for the first year and filled out the examination form for semesters I and II. The Petitioner was declared to have failed (ATKT) in the first year. However, he was promoted to the second year of the B.B.A. course. In 2023, he failed in some subjects of the second year and also could not clear the first-year subjects. Therefore, in April 2024, he again filled out the form for the first and second years of B.B.A. In the said examination, he cleared the first-year B.B.A. course, and thereafter, in July 2024, he was allowed to take admission to the third-year course. In April 2025, he appeared for the second-year examination in pending subjects and for the fifth and sixth semesters of the third year. He cleared the written papers for the second year, as well as the fifth and sixth semesters examinations of the third year. However, inadvertently, he failed to appear for the practical examination/VIVA, i.e. internal assessment for two subjects each of the fifth and sixth year, i.e., semester fifth- 515(C)- ‘Cross cultural HR and Industrial Relations’, 516(C)- ‘Cases in Human Resource Management’, semester sixth- 615(C)- ‘Global Human Resource Management’ and 616(C)- ‘Recent Trends and HR Accounting’. Therefore, his result was declared as failed.

4. In October 2025, while filling out the online form for the practical examination and VIVA, which was to be scheduled in October

2025, the website of the University reflected that his PRN validity had expired. Thus, he could not fill out the examination form. As such, he applied to the Principal of the College to allow him to fill the examination form and permit him to appear for the practical examination and VIVA. The examination department of the College forwarded the said letter to the Director of the Examinations and Evaluation Department, University, Pune, on the same day. He had taken continuous follow-up with Respondent No. 4 College. He also pointed out the circular (जाहीर प्रगटन) issued by the University on 7th November 2025, which permits students to extend the course by one year to complete the same. However, it was informed that the N+2+1 period, including an additional year of grace, was extended for the academic year for students admitted in 2020-2021. Aggrieved by the same, the Petitioner preferred this Petition seeking direction against Respondent Nos. 1 to 3, to revive/extend the validity of his PRN number and permit him to appear for practical examination and VIVA to complete the BBA examination.

5. We have considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the Petitioner, the learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, the learned counsel for Respondent No. 4 and the learned AGP for Respondent No. 1.

6. Mr. Kadam, learned counsel for the Petitioner, vehemently contended that, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Petitioner could not attend the examinations for the years 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. Thereafter, the Petitioner appeared for the written examination; however, he could not appear for the practical examination and VIVA. Therefore, he prayed that the Petitioner be permitted to appear for the said examination by extending the validity of the PRN on humanitarian grounds. He further argued that the action on the part of the Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 for not extending/reviving the PRN validity to enable the Petitioner to fill up the practical examination/VIVA form is arbitrary, discriminatory and a violation of the principles of natural justice. Therefore, interference is warranted in the Petition by directing the Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 to extend the PRN validity.

7. The learned counsel further attempted to rely on the circular dated 7th November 2025, issued by the Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, the Controller of Examination and the University, which extended the validity of PRNs for students who had taken admission for the academic year 2020-2021 for one year. Therefore, he contended that the said action by Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 is discriminatory, as they have not permitted the students who had taken admission for the academic year 2019-2020.

Hence, he urged that the petition be allowed.

8. *Per contra*, Mr. Anbhule, the learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 resisted the Petition on the ground that the Petitioner has failed to complete the course within the stipulated period specified in the guidelines of the UGC i.e. within a period of six years (for the 3 years course) from the date of the admission and therefore as per clause 2 (a), (b) and (c) of the said guidelines, the Petitioner is not entitled for the extension of the PRN validity. He further submits that the Petitioner voluntarily did not appear for the online examination for the years 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 and suppressed the said material facts from the Court. He has not come to the Court with clean hands, and therefore, he is not entitled to the relief as claimed.

9. In support of his submissions, the learned counsel has tendered a communication dated 15th October 2025, issued by the Vice Chancellor of the University to the College, along with the UGC guidelines for determining the period within which students may be allowed to qualify for a degree. The same is taken on record and marked **'X'** for identification. He drew our attention to clauses 1 to 3 of the said guidelines and submitted that, as per the said guidelines the Applicant has to complete his course

within a period of six years i.e. normal period of three years plus extended time span of two years for the completion of the programme and in exceptional circumstances, it can be further extended for a grace period of one year. Ordinarily, no student should be given time beyond the extended period of two years. As such, the Petitioner is not entitled to seek a direction for extension of PRN validity on humanitarian grounds, as his mistake cannot be termed as a bona fide mistake. Hence, he urged the Petition be dismissed.

10. Mrs. Helekar, learned counsel for Respondent No. 4, supported the contention of Mr. Anbhule. Similar is the stand of Mr. Badgujar.

11. Having heard the rival contentions of the parties, at the outset, a short question that arises before us as to "*whether the Petitioner is entitled to seek the direction against Respondents for extension of PRN validity for a further period of one year to permit him to fill the form for practical examination and VIVA of two subjects each of fifth and sixth semester viz. semester fifth- 515(C)- 'Cross cultural HR and Industrial Relations', 516(C)- 'Cases in Human Resource Management' and semester sixth- 615(C)- 'Global Human Resource Management' and 616(C)- 'Recent Trends and HR Accounting' of B.B.A. course*".

12. While dealing with the above controversy, it is worth noting that the Petitioner does not dispute that he took admission for the B.B.A. course in the academic year 2019-2020 at Respondent No. 4 College. Similarly, he voluntarily did not appear for the examinations in 2019-2020 and 2020-2021, either in person or online. The normal period, or the minimum duration prescribed for the completion of the said course, is three years. While dealing with the aforesaid question, we would like to reproduce the UGC guidelines as under:

> *1. **Normally, the student is expected to complete his programme within the minimum period as laid down under the relevant Regulation of the university** which should be in conformity with the UGC Regulations on the award of First Degree and Masters Degree and also in line with the notification, issued from time to time, on Specification of Degrees under Section 22 of UGC Act, 1956.*
>
> *2. **A student who, for whatever reason, is not able to complete the programme within the normal period or the minimum duration prescribed for the programme, may be allowed a two-year period beyond the normal period to clear the backlog to be qualified for the degree**. The general formula, therefore, should be as follows:*
>
> *a) **Time Span=N+2 years for the completion of the programme**, where N stands for the normal or minimum duration prescribed for completion of the programme.*
>
> *b) **In exceptional circumstances, a further extension of one more year may be granted**. The exceptional circumstances be spelt out clearly by the relevant Statutory body concerned of the university.*
>
> *c) During the extended period, the student shall be considered as a private candidate and also not be eligible for ranking.*
>
> *3. **Ordinarily, no student should be given time beyond the extended period of two years. However, in exceptional circumstances and on the basis of the merits of each case, the university may allow a student one more year for completion of the programme**.*

13. A plain reading of the above guidelines indicates that a student must complete their course within the normal period stipulated by the University. If the student could not complete the programme within the normal period or minimum duration prescribed for the programme, the said period may be extended by two years beyond the normal period to clear the backlog and qualify for the degree. Ordinarily, no student should be given time beyond the extended period of two years. However, ***in exceptional circumstances*** and based on the merits of each case, the University ***may allow one additional year*** to complete the programme. Accordingly, the University has also given the formula as follows.

> "**Time span = N+2** years for the completion of the programme. where **N stands for the normal or minimum duration** of 3 years prescribed for completion of the programme.

14. The aforesaid guidelines themselves indicate that, in exceptional circumstances, a further extension of one year may be granted. While granting a further one-year extension, the College and the University must examine the circumstances set out in the application to seek an extension of a further one-year period. If the University finds that the said circumstances were exceptional, only then can a one-year extension be granted. In light of the above guidelines, it would be appropriate to consider the facts of the case at hand.

15. It is undisputed that the Petitioner has taken admission to the B.B.A. course in April 2019-2020. That means the Petitioner has to complete the said course within three years, i.e. from April 2019 to April 2022. However, the record shows that the Petitioner did not attend the course in 2019-2020 and 2020-2021, nor did he appear for the examination, either physically or online. Thereafter, in 2021-2022, he again filled out the first- and second-semester examination forms. It appears from the mark sheet (page 36) for April 2022 that ***the first-semester result was declared as failed (ATKT)***. However, as per the policy, he was promoted to the second year. On perusal of the mark-sheet for April 2023 (page 35), it is evident that the Petitioner failed (ATKT) in the first year of the B.B.A. He was unable to take admission to the third-year course in April 2023. So again, in October 2023, he appeared for the first-year examination; however, his result (page 33) was declared as failed (ATKT). Thereafter, he cleared his first-year examination in April 2024. However, he was declared to have failed (ATKT) in the second-year course. In the October 2024 examination, the Petitioner failed in two second-year subjects. Then, in April 2025 (page 28), Petitioner cleared all written papers of the second and third year of the B.B.A. course, but he failed in the practical examination and VIVA, i.e. two subjects each of fifth and sixth semester viz. semester fifth- 515(C)- 'Cross cultural HR and Industrial Relations', 516(C)- 'Cases in Human Resource Management'

and semester sixth- 615(C)- ‘Global Human Resource Management’ and 616(C)- ‘Recent Trends and HR Accounting’. Therefore, his result was declared as failed.

16. Thus, it is evident that until April 2025, the Petitioner failed to complete the B.B.A. Course within the prescribed time period, including the extended Two-year period and the one year granted (6 years) as an exceptional circumstance. In view of the guidelines, it was incumbent on the Petitioner to complete his B.B.A. course by 2021-2022, but the Petitioner did not appear for the first-year examination in 2019-2020 and 2020-2021, nor did he complete the course within the normal period stipulated in the guidelines. As per the circular/guidelines, the periods were extended by two years beyond the normal period to clear the backlog and complete the course, i.e., 2022-2023 and 2023-2024. Still, the Petitioner has not cleared the second and third years of the B.B.A. course up to April 2024. A further extension of one year was granted and he was promoted to complete the course within 2024-2025, but he voluntarily did not appear for practical examination and VIVA of two subjects each of fifth and sixth semester viz. semester fifth- two subjects each of fifth and sixth semester viz. semester fifth- 515(C)- ‘Cross cultural HR and Industrial Relations’, 516(C)- ‘Cases in Human Resource Management’ and semester sixth-

615(C)- ‘Global Human Resource Management’ and 616(C)- ‘Recent Trends and HR Accounting’. Therefore, the Petitioner’s result was declared as failed in the practical examination and VIVA (page 28). Thus, it appears that the Petitioner has exhausted the six-year period stipulated in the guidelines to complete his BBA course. Therefore, the PRN validity was shown as expired after the said period.

17. It is pertinent to note that the Petitioner did not appear, either physically or online, for the examination in 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. Similarly, until April 2024, he had not cleared his first year of the course. He failed to complete it within the stipulated time. Likewise, the Petitioner failed to appear for the practical examination and VIVA for the fifth and sixth semesters in October 2024 and April 2025. Therefore, he was declared failed. In such circumstances, whether it can be said that, in exceptional circumstances, the Petitioner was entitled to seek an extension of one more year (seventh year). In exceptional circumstances, only an additional one-year period (sixth year) needs to be extended. Still, the Petitioner failed to point out the exceptional circumstances entitling him to claim the extension of a further one-year period. However, on humanitarian grounds, Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 have extended the PRN validity by one more year and further permitted the Petitioner to complete the said course.

Despite the said one-year extension, the Petitioner failed to appear for the practical examination and VIVA in October 2024 and in April 2025 and was therefore declared failed.

18. In such an eventuality, whether it can be said that the Petitioner is still entitled to a further extension of a one-year period by invoking Article 226 of the Constitution of India or whether the Court could invoke Article 226 of the Constitution for a person who was not vigilant of his rights or was negligent in performing his duty. Having considered the above discussion, as well as perusal of the record and mark-sheets annexed with the Petition, it is apparent that the Petitioner was negligent in performing his duty. Therefore, his mistake/negligence cannot be termed as a *bona fide* mistake; as such, he is not entitled to seek further direction against Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 for extension of PRN validity on humanitarian grounds. Thus, the Petition is liable to be dismissed on the said ground alone.

19. Another ground argued by the learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 is that the Petitioner has suppressed material facts from the Court and failed to disclose them in the Petition. Therefore, he is not entitled to seek relief as claimed in the Petition.

20. While dealing with the above issue, we would like to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kishore Samrite v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Ors.***[1] wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered the law laid down in various cases dealing with situations where litigants with the intent to deceive and mislead the Courts, initiated proceedings without full disclosure of facts and came to the courts with 'unclean hands', such litigants are neither entitled to be heard on the merits of the case nor entitled to any relief as they have abused the process of the Court. We would like to reproduce some of the principles recapitulated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in paragraphs No. 32.1 to 32.8 and 35 to 39 and 46 of ***Kishor Samrite*** (cited supra):

> *32.1) Courts have, over the centuries,* ***frowned upon litigants who, with intent to deceive and mislead the Courts, initiated proceedings without full disclosure of facts and came to the courts with 'unclean hands.' Courts have held that such litigants are neither entitled to be heard on the merits of the case nor entitled to any relief.***
> *32.2) The people who approach the Court for relief on an ex parte statement are under a contract with the court that they would state the whole case fully and fairly to the court, and where the litigant has broken such faith, the discretion of the court cannot be exercised in favour of such a litigant.*
> *32.3)* ***The obligation to approach the Court with clean hands is an absolute obligation*** *and has repeatedly been reiterated by this Court.*
> *32.4) Quests for personal gains have become so intense that those involved in litigation do not hesitate to take shelter of falsehood and misrepresent and suppress facts in the court proceedings. Materialism, opportunism and malicious intent have overshadowed the old ethos of litigative values for small gains.*
> *32.5)* ***A litigant who attempts to pollute the stream of justice or who***

1 (2013) 2 SCC 398.

touches the pure fountain of justice with tainted hands is not entitled to any relief, interim or final.

32.6) The Court must ensure that its process is not abused, and in order to prevent abuse of process of the court, it would be justified even in insisting on the furnishing of security and in cases of serious abuse, the Court would be duty-bound to impose heavy costs.

32.7) Wherever a public interest is invoked, the Court must examine the petition carefully to ensure that there is genuine public interest involved. The stream of justice should not be allowed to be polluted by unscrupulous litigants.

32.8) The Court, especially the Supreme Court, has to maintain strictest vigilance over the abuse of the process of court, and ordinarily meddlesome bystanders should not be granted a "visa". Many societal pollutants create new problems of unredressed grievances, and the Court should endure to take cases where the justice of the lis well-justifies it. (Refer : Dalip Singh vs. State U.P., Amar Singh v. Union of India and State of Uttaranchal v. Balwant Singh Chaufal).

…. ……

35) ……..It is the bounden duty of the Court to ensure that dishonesty and any attempt to surpass the legal process must be effectively curbed and the Court must ensure that there is no wrongful, unauthorized or unjust gain to anyone as a result of abuse of the process of the Court. One way to curb this tendency is to impose realistic or punitive costs.

36) ***The party not approaching the Court with clean hands would be liable to be non-suited, and such a party, which has also succeeded in polluting the stream of justice by making patently false statements, cannot claim relief, especially under Article 136 of the Constitution. While approaching the court, a litigant must state correct facts and come with clean hands****. Where such a statement of facts is based on some information, the source of such information must also be disclosed. Totally misconceived petition amounts to abuse of the process of the court, and such a litigant is not required to be dealt with lightly, as a petition containing misleading and inaccurate statements, if filed, to achieve an ulterior purpose, amounts to abuse of the process of the court. A litigant is bound to make "full and true disclosure of facts". (Refer : Tilokchand Motichand vs. H.B. Munshi[1969 (1) SCC 110]; A. Shanmugam v. Ariya Kshatriya Rajakula Vamsathu Madalaya Nandhavana Paripalanai Sangam & Anr. [(2012) 6 SCC 430]; Chandra Shashi v. Anil Kumar Verma [(1995) SCC 1 421]; Abhyudya Sanstha v. Union of India & Ors. [(2011) 6 SCC 145]; State of Madhya Pradesh v. Narmada Bachao Andolan & Anr. [(2011) 7 SCC 639]; Kalyaneshwari v. Union of India & Anr. [(2011) 3 SCC 287].*

37) The person seeking equity must do equity. It is not just the clean hands, but also a clean mind, a clean heart and a clean objective that are the equi-fundamentals of judicious litigation. The legal maxim ***'jure naturae aequum est neminem cum alterius detrimento et injuria fieri locupletiorem,'*** which means that it is a law of nature that one should not be enriched by the loss or injury to another, is the percept for Courts. *Wide jurisdiction of the court should not become a source of abuse of the process of law by the disgruntled litigant.* ***Careful exercise is also necessary to ensure that the litigation is genuine, not motivated by extraneous considerations and imposes an obligation upon the litigant to disclose the true facts and approach the court with clean hands***.

38) ***No litigant can play 'hide and seek' with the courts or adopt 'pick and choose'. True facts ought to be disclosed as the Court knows law, but not facts. One who does not come with candid facts and clean breast cannot hold a writ of the court with soiled hands.*** *Suppression or concealment of material facts is impermissible to a litigant or even as a technique of advocacy. In such cases, the Court is duty-bound to discharge the rule nisi, and such an applicant is required to be dealt with for contempt of court for abusing the process of the court. {K.D. Sharma v. Steel Authority of India Ltd. & Ors. [(2008) 12 SCC 481].*

39) ***Another settled canon of administration of justice is that no litigant should be permitted to misuse the judicial process by filing frivolous petitions***. *No litigant has a right to unlimited drought upon the court time and public money in order to get his affairs settled in the manner as he wishes. Easy access to justice should not be used as a licence to file misconceived and frivolous petitions. (Buddhi Kota Subbarao (Dr.) v. K. Parasaran, (1996) 5 SCC 530).*

46) It is a settled canon that no litigant has a right to unlimited drought upon the court time and public money in order to get his affairs settled in the manner as he wishes. The privilege of easy access to justice has been abused by these petitioners by filing frivolous and misconceived petitions. On the basis of incorrect and incomplete allegations, they had created urgency for expeditious hearing of the petitions, which never existed. Even this Court had to spend days to reach at the truth. Prima facie, it is clear that both these petitioners have misstated facts, withheld true facts and even given false and incorrect affidavits. They well knew that the courts are going to rely upon their pleadings and affidavits while passing appropriate orders. The Director General of Police, U.P., was required to file an affidavit, and the CBI was directed to conduct an investigation. ***Truth being the basis of the justice delivery system, it was important for this Court to reach at the truth, which we were able to reach at with the able assistance of all the counsel and have***

> ***no hesitation in holding that the cases of both the petitioners suffered from falsehood, were misconceived and were a patent misuse of judicial process. The abuse of the process of the Court and not approaching the Court with complete facts and clean hands has compelled this Court to impose heavy and penal costs on the persons acting as next friends in the writ petitions before the High Court. This Court cannot permit the judicial process to become an instrument of oppression or abuse or to subvert justice by unscrupulous litigants like the petitioners in the present case***.

21. In ***Bhaskar Laxman Jadhav and Ors. Vs. Karamveer Kakasaheb Wagh Education Society and Ors.***[2], the Hon'ble Apex Court, in paragraphs 42 to 47, dealt with the conduct of the parties and the issue of '***suppression of facts'*** which read as under:

> *42) While dealing with the conduct of the parties, we may also notice the submission of learned counsel for respondent No.1 to the effect that the petitioners are guilty of suppression of a material fact from this Court, namely, the rejection on 2nd May 2003 of the first application for extension of time filed by the trustees and the finality attached to it.* ***These facts have not been clearly disclosed to this Court by the petitioners. It was submitted that, in view of the suppression, special leave to appeal should not be granted to the petitioners****.*
> *43) Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that no material facts have been withheld from this Court. It was submitted that while the order dated 2nd May 2003 was undoubtedly not filed, its existence was not material in view of subsequent developments that had taken place. We cannot agree.*
> *44)* ***It is not for a litigant to decide what fact is material for adjudicating a case and what is not material. It is the obligation of a litigant to disclose all the facts of a case and leave the decision-making to the Court****. True, there is a mention of the order dated 2nd May 2003 in the order dated 24th July 2006 passed by the JCC, but that is not enough disclosure. The petitioners have not clearly disclosed the facts and circumstances in which the order dated 2nd May 2003 was passed, or that it has attained finality.*
> *45) We may only refer to two cases on this subject. In Hari Narain v. Badri Das, AIR 1963 SC 1558, stress was laid on litigants eschewing inaccurate, untrue or misleading statements; otherwise, leave granted to an appellant may be revoked. It was observed as follows:*

2

> *"**It is of utmost importance that in making material statements and setting forth grounds in applications for special leave, care must be taken not to make any statements which are inaccurate, untrue or misleading**. In dealing with applications for special leave, the Court naturally takes statements of fact and grounds of fact contained in the petitions at their face value, and it would be unfair to betray the confidence of the Court by making statements which are untrue and misleading. That is why we have come to the conclusion that in the present case, special leave granted to the appellant ought to be revoked. Accordingly, special leave is revoked, and the appeal is dismissed. The appellant will pay the costs of the respondent."*
>
> *46) More recently, in Ramjas Foundation v. Union of India, (2010) 14 SCC 38, the case law on the subject was discussed. **It was held that if a litigant does not come to the Court with clean hands, he is not entitled to be heard, and indeed, such a person is not entitled to any relief from any judicial forum.** It was said:*
> *"The principle that a person who does not come to the court with clean hands is not entitled to be heard on the merits of his grievance and, in any case, such person is not entitled to any relief is applicable not only to the petitions filed under Articles 32, 226 and 136 of the Constitution but also to the cases instituted in others courts and judicial forums. The object underlying the principle is that every court is not only entitled but is duty bound to protect itself from unscrupulous litigants who do not have any respect for truth and who try to pollute the stream of justice by resorting to falsehood or by making misstatement or by suppressing facts which have a bearing on adjudication of the issue(s) arising in the case."*
>
> *47) A mere reference to the order dated 2nd May 2003, en passant, in the order dated 24th July 2006 does not serve the requirement of disclosure. **It is not for the Court to look into every word of the pleadings, documents and annexures to fish out a fact. It is for the litigant to come up-front and clean with all material facts and then, on the basis of the submissions made by learned counsel, leave it to the Court to determine whether or not a particular fact is relevant for arriving at a decision**. Unfortunately, the petitioners have not done this and must suffer the consequence thereof.*

22. In light of these settled principles, it would be appropriate to examine the facts in the case at hand. A bare perusal of the Petition reveals that the Petitioner did not disclose that he failed to appear for the first-year

examination, either physically or online, in the academic years 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. Similarly, he did not disclose that he had failed the first-year examination until October 2024. Likewise, he did not appear for practical examination and VIVA for the fifth and sixth semesters in October 2024 and April 2025 and thereby suppressed the said material facts from the Court. It is to be noted that the learned Advocate for Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 brought the said facts to the notice of the Court.

23. Having considered the aforesaid position, in our view, the Petitioner failed to make out a case to invoke Art.226 of the Constitution to direct the Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 to extend/ revive the Petitioner's PRN validity for a further period of one year to permit him to fill up the form for the practical examinations and VIVA for two subjects each in fifth and sixth semesters. On the contrary, the Petitioner is prima facie found guilty of suppressing the facts. He approached the Court with unclean hands.

24. Thus, the Petitioner has filed the instant Petition with an ulterior motive and abused the process of the Court. Consequently, the Petitioner is not entitled to the relief as claimed. As a result, the Petition, being bereft of merits, stands dismissed.

25. The Rule is discharged. No order as to costs.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.) (RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

Vishal Parekar