



2026:CGHC:14947-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WA No. 256 of 2026**

- 1** - Anvesha Khan D/o Abdul Javed Khan Aged About 19 Years R/o- Mother Teresa Ward, Jagdalpur, District- Bastar (C.G.)
- 2** - Aradhana Netam D/o Mangdu Ram Netam Aged About 21 Years R/o- House No. 100, Matiya Para, Lanjoda, District- Kondagaon (C.G.) 494229
- 3** - Bhupendra Thakur S/o Sampat Thakur Aged About 18 Years R/o- House No. 11, Babu Para, Badegodre, District- Dakshin Bastar, Dantewada (C.G.) 494552
- 4** - Bimla D/o Gadruram Aged About 19 Years R/o- Dongripara, Chatodi, P.O. Makdi, District- Kondagaon (C.G.) 494226
- 5** - Dileep Kumar S/o Aayta Aged About 19 Years R/o- Geedam Naala, Chetiya para, Sukma, District- Sukma (C.G.) 494111
- 6** - Garima Thakur D/o Meghnath Thakur Aged About 18 Years R/o- Patel Para, Village- Munjala, P.O.- Chapaka, District- Bastar (C.G.) 494224
- 7** - Hemlata Singh D/o Shyam Singh Aged About 20 Years R/o- Village- Sihari, Tehsil- Durkondul, District- Kanker (C.G.)
- 8** - Kalpana Belsariya D/o- Son Singh Belasariya Aged About 21 Years R/o- Garh Para, Chottedongar, District Narayanapur (C.G.) 494661
- 9** - Khileshwari D/o Shankar Lal Aged About 19 Years R/o- Village- 04, Randhana, P.O. Makdi, District- Kondagaon (C.G.) 494226
- 10** - Leena Markam D/o- Aayatu Ram Markam Aged About 19 Years R/o- House No. 144, Madaga Para, Palli Sampur, District- Kondagaon (C.G.) 494226
- 11** - Neha Marpalli D/o Nagesh Marpalli Aged About 22 Years R/o- 22, Gram Panchayat- Dampaya, Dudehda, District- Bijapur (C.G.) 494448
- 12** - Nisha D/o Motiram Mandavi Aged About 19 Years R/o- 091 Village- Khetarpal, Post- Khetarpal, District- Kondagaon (C.G.) 494331
- 13** - Pinki Sori D/o Laxman Sori Aged About 18 Years R/o Village- Dongriguda, Tehsil And District- Kondagaon (C.G.)



- 14** - Poonam Ghritlahare D/o Gobind Ghritlahare Aged About 20 Years R/o- 6, Shanti Nagar, Ward No. 01, Ahilda, District- Balodabazaar-Bhatapara (C.G.) 493526
- 15** - Poonam Mandavi D/o Sahdev Mandavi Aged About 21 Years R/o- House No. 219, Ward No. 14, Palaari, District- Kondagaon (C.G.) 494226
- 16** - Priti Thakur D/o Krishna Kumar Thakur Aged About 19 Years R/o- 21, Manjhicherra, Sidawand, P.O. Kohkameta, District- Kondagaon (C.G.) 494331
- 17** - Ratula Netam D/o Sukhdev Netam Aged About 19 Years R/o- House No. 9, Patel Para, Ward No. 03, Hadigaon, District- Kondagaon (C.G.) 494226
- 18** - Shruti Yalam D/o Gopal Yalam Aged About 19 Years R/o- House No. 81, Ward No. 05, Yalam Para, Gram Panchayat- Anrjunalli, Rudram, Bijapur, District- Bijapur (C.G.) 494446
- 19** - Tanoo Mourya D/o Ishwar Babu Mourya Aged About 18 Years R/o Kerlapal, Tehsil And District- Sukma (C.G.) 494122
- 20** - Zahed Begum D/o Sufi Mansur Ahmad Aged About 19 Years R/o- 57, Gurudwara Road, Infront Of Imam Bara, Indra Ward, Jagdalpur, District- Bastar (C.G.) 494001
- 21** - Budhmani Baghel D/o- Piladas Baghel Aged About 20 Years R/o- Village- Mawaliguda, P.O. Khorkosa, Tehsil And District- Bastar (C.G.) 494223

... Appellants

versus

- 1** - State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary To The Govt. of Chhattisgarh, Department Of Medical Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, P.S. Rakhi, Raipur Chhattisgarh
- 2** - The Commissioner Directorate of Medical Education, Swasthya Bhawan, North Block, Second Floor, Nawa Raipur, Atal Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh
- 3** - The Director Directorate of Medical Education, Swasthya Bhawan, North Block, Second Floor, Nawa Raipur, Atal Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh
- 4** - The Chairman Counselling Committee, Directorate Of Medical Education, Swasthya Bhawan, North Block, Second Floor, Nawa Raipur, Atal Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh
- 5** - Chhattisgarh Professional Examination Board Through Controller Of Examination Vyapam Bhawan, North Block, Section- 19, Nawa Raipur, Atal Nagar, Raipur



6 - Indian Nursing Council Through Its Secretary, Address- 8th Floor, Nbcc Center, Plot No. 2, Community Center Okhla Phase- I, New Delhi- 110020

... Respondents

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Appellants	:	Mr. Aditya Agrawal, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Mr. Prasun Bhaduri, Deputy Advocate General
For Respondent No.5	:	Mr. Avinash Singh, Advocate
For Respondent No.6	:	Mr. R. K. Mishra, Dy. Solicitor General

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

01.04.2026

1. Heard Mr. Aditya Agrawal, learned counsel for the appellants. Also heard Mr. Prasun Bhaduri, learned Deputy Advocate General, appearing for the State, Mr. Avinash Singh, learned counsel, appearing for respondent No.5 and Mr. R.K. Mishra, learned Deputy Solicitor General, appearing for respondent No.6.

2. The present intra Court appeal has been filed by the appellants against the order dated **14.01.2026** passed by the learned Single Judge in **WPC No. 116 of 2026** (*Anvesha Khan & Others vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Others*), whereby the writ petition filed by the appellants/writ petitioners herein has been dismissed by the learned Single Judge.

3. It has been pointed out by learned counsel for the parties that in an identical matter, this Bench had dismissed **WA No. 169 of 2026**



(Sabina Ekka & Others vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Others) vide

order dated **20.02.2026**, observing as follows :

“7. *The undisputed position is that the last date for admission to the first year B.Sc. Nursing Course was fixed as 31.12.2025 in terms of the notified academic schedule. The appellants approached the learned Single Judge seeking extension of the said cut-off date on the ground that the qualifying percentile was reduced on 29.12.2025, leaving insufficient time to secure admission. The learned Single Judge declined to grant the relief, and we find no infirmity in the said view.*

8. *It is well settled that the admission schedule for professional courses must be adhered to strictly and cannot ordinarily be altered by judicial intervention. The cut-off date is fixed to maintain certainty, uniformity and discipline in the academic calendar. Once the prescribed date has expired, issuance of directions to reopen or extend the counselling process would lead to administrative uncertainty and may adversely affect the academic session. The power under Article 226, though wide, is to be exercised in accordance with settled principles and not in a manner that disturbs the statutory framework governing admissions.*

9. *The reliance placed by the appellants on the reduction of percentile by the National Board of Examinations in Medical Sciences in relation to NEET PG–2025 does not advance their case, as the said decision pertains to a distinct course governed by a separate regulatory regime. No automatic parity can be claimed for B.Sc. Nursing admissions on that basis. Likewise, extension of timelines by another State Government cannot create an enforceable right in favour of the appellants in the absence of a similar policy decision by the competent authority in the present case.*

10. *We also find that the regulatory framework governing the nursing course prescribes a structured academic calendar. The categorization into Regular*



and Irregular Batches cannot be construed as conferring an unrestricted power to grant admissions beyond the notified deadline. The appellants participated in the admission process with full knowledge of the stipulated schedule and cannot, after expiry of the cut-off date, seek extension as a matter of right.

11. The learned Single Judge has exercised discretion judiciously and in consonance with settled principles of law. We find no arbitrariness, illegality or perversity in the impugned order warranting interference in intra-court appeal.

*12. Accordingly, the appeal being devoid of merit, stands **dismissed**. No order as to costs.”*

They further submitted that since the facts and issue involved in the present case is identical to that of WA No. 169 of 2026, this appeal may also be dismissed in the same terms.

4. Having considered the rival submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the materials available on record, it is evident that the facts and the issues involved in the present appeal are identical to those in **WA No. 169 of 2026**. Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to adopt the view taken in **WA No. 169 of 2026** and does not find any reason to take a different view in the present matter.

5. Accordingly, the present appeal is **dismissed** in terms of the order dated **20.02.2026** passed in **WA No. 169 of 2026**.

**Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge**

**Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice**