



2026:HHC:35218

**Akshat Singh Vs. The Vice Chancellor,
H.P. National Law University & Ors.**

CWP No.10560/2026

30.06.2026 Present: Mr. Ajay Sharma, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Atharv Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amar Vivek Aggarwal, Advocate (via V.C.) with Mr. Rajesh Kumar Parmar and Mr. Gourav Thakur, Advocate, for respondents No.1 to 3.

Notice. Mr. Gourav Thakur, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3. Issue notice to respondent No.4, returnable for **28.07.2026**, on taking steps within one week.

List on 28.07.2026.

Appearing respondents to file reply in the meanwhile.

CMP No. 15523/2026

Heard and considered the case file.

2. The petitioner seeks direction to allow him to provisionally attend the classes of the 9th Semester as, according to him, he has already completed the 8th Semester by attending the classes thereof. He also seeks direction to allow him to appear in the 8th Semester examination.

CWP No. 19747 of 2025 was filed by the petitioner seeking direction to allow him to provisionally appear in the 7th Semester End-Term Examination. Vide order dated 12.12.2025 passed in said petition, the petitioner was permitted to provisionally appear in the said examination, subject to the terms imposed therein. During the pendency of



the writ petition, the respondents-University apprised the Court that, consequent to the interim order dated 12.12.2025, the petitioner was allowed to provisionally appear in the 7th Semester End-Term Examination, which he had passed. The petitioner was also permitted to provisionally attend the classes of the 8th Semester vide order dated 20.03.2026 passed in the said writ petition.

The writ petition was disposed of 12.05.2026 with following operative directions: -

“.....Learned counsel for the respondents has opposed the prayer of the petitioners as also, all the grounds taken by them. However, at this stage, I am of the view that since the petitioners had been permitted to provisionally undertake the 7th Semester end-term examination, which the petitioners have not only undertaken but cleared as well & the petitioner are now attending classes of 8th Semester, keeping in view the issues highlighted for the petitioners about absence of remedial classes for them in 7th Semester, reliance placed for the petitioners upon several decisions of different High Courts as also, the applicable rules position, ground of discrimination raised by them, interest of justice will be met in the given facts of the case if a direction is issued to respondent- Himachal Pradesh National Law University to reconsider its decision of detention of the petitioners in 7th Semester, afresh, and for allowing them to regularly attend 8th Semester classes. Ordered accordingly. Fresh decision be taken expeditiously preferably within four weeks keeping in view not only applicable rules position but also keeping in mind the academic interest of the students. The decision so taken be also intimated to the petitioners. Till such time, the petitioners be permitted to continue to attend the classes of 8th Semester.”



Pursuant to the aforesaid directions, the respondents-National Law University constituted a Committee to reconsider their decision to detain the petitioner in the 7th Semester. The Committee furnished its report on 04.06.2026 (Annexure P-5), making recommendations against the petitioner. The detailed report of the Committee is self-explanatory. The facts of the case have already been noticed in the judgment dated 12.05.2026 rendered in CWP No. 19747 of 2025 (*Akshat Singh vs. State of H.P. & Ors.*).

3. Admittedly, the petitioner had an attendance percentage of 57.29% in the 7th Semester. It is not in dispute, as contended by learned Advocate for the respondents-University, that the Vice-Chancellor is empowered to condone shortage of attendance only in cases where the attendance percentage is not less than 65%, as the minimum required attendance in a semester is 70% under the applicable Acts/Rules/Regulations.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that had the respondents-University conducted remedial classes, as were conducted for some other students, which is apparent from the decisions appended at Pages 174 to 189 of the paper book, the petitioner would have got an opportunity to rectify/improve his attendance. Here again, it is not in dispute that the applicable Act/Rules/Regulations do not envisage the holding of remedial classes. Learned Advocate for the respondents-University has apprised that remedial classes



2026:HHC:35218

were held only during the academic session 2022-23 in the emerging situation prevailing at that time. The recourse to remedial classes adopted at that time cannot be treated as a routine measure to be resorted to every time to condone attendance shortages.

Petitioner's attendance in the 7th Semester fell way short of the prescribed requirement. The report submitted by the Committee constituted by the respondents-University pursuant to decision of petitioner's previous writ petition cannot be discarded in the manner urged for the petitioner at this stage. The judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in *Court on its Own Motion in Suicide Committed by Sushant Rohilla, Law Student of I.P. University v. ...*, W.P. (CRL) No. 793/2017, decided on 03.11.2025, which was, inter alia, relied upon while deciding petitioner's earlier writ petition, has been stayed by the Hon'ble Apex Court vide order dated 26.05.2026 passed in SLP (Criminal) Diary No(s). 29604/2026.

In view of above, no case for grant of interim relief is made out. Accordingly, the application is dismissed.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

30th June, 2026 (Rohit)