



2026:HHC:21970

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.9088 of 2026

Decided on: 5th June, 2026

Kaviraj

.....**Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others

.....**Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Sohail Khan, Advocate vice
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General
with Mr. L.N. Sharma, Additional
Advocate General, for respondents No.1
and 2.

Mr. L.S. Mehta, Advocate, for
respondent No.3.

Ms. Kanta Thakur, Advocate, for
respondents No.4 and 5.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. L.N. Sharma, learned Additional
Advocate General, Mr. L.S. Mehta and Ms. Kanta Thakur,
learned counsel, appear and waive service of notice on
behalf of the respective respondents.

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



2. In view of the grievances, documents appended alongwith the writ petition and nature of order being passed hereinafter, reply of the writ petition is not required to be called from the respondents. The matter has accordingly been heard.

3. The case set up by the petitioner is that he successfully completed the B. Tech Degree course from respondent No.4-University under a specific registration number. His name appeared in the student registration as well as in the admission record. The University has not issued detailed marks cards to the petitioner for any of the semester examinations till date. It is further the case of the petitioner that though he has successfully completed B. Tech Degree course and cleared all the exams, but the respondent-University has not issued him provisional and final degree alongwith other relevant documents till date.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner had made a request to the respondent-University for rectifying the errors. The same was not considered by the Committee duly constituted by the Government for verifying the record and supplying photocopies of relevant documents under the custody of SIT under the Chairmanship of Superintendent of Police,



District Solan. Feeling aggrieved, the petitioner has filed this writ petition.

Learned counsel for respondents No.4 & 5 stated that there seems to be mismatch of marks in the Gazette and DMC of 3rd semester as the gazette/result of 3rd semester shows 701/1200 marks, but as per entry made of DMC on green sheet, it shows 684/1200, which is a clear mismatch and that the correction, if any, is to be done as per the Gazette only.

4. Learned counsel for the parties have jointly submitted that the issue involved in this writ petition is now squarely covered by ***Priya Thakur Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others***², whereunder, in similar circumstances, petitioner therein was permitted to move appropriate application before the learned Trial Court where the mark sheet in original stood deposited and on receipt of such application, learned Trial Court was to pass appropriate orders.

5. In view of above, without examining the merits of the matter, 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

² CWP No.2690 of 2024 decided on 22.04.2025



original are lying deposited. In case of moving of such application, the concerned learned Trial Court shall pass appropriate orders thereupon. All rights & contentions of the parties are left open.

Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

June 05, 2026
Mukesh

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge