



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 32242 of 2011

Smt. Sandhya

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : R.B.S. Rathaur, S.S. Chauhan, Virendra Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C., Neeraj Tiwari, Rohit Pandey, Saurabh Srivastava, Yatindra Shukla, Yogendra Shukla

Along with :

1. Writ - C No. 40139 of 2004:

Shashi Patel and others

Versus

State of U.P. Thru Secy. Higher Education and Ors.

Court No. - 37

HON'BLE KSHITIJ SHAIENDRA, J.

1. The matter was heard in between the petitioner and the counsel for the University and in furtherance of the order dated 09.08.2023 particularly query raised in second last paragraph thereof.

2. Submission has been made by the University counsel that at page 116 of the paper book of the writ petition, as against the name of the petitioner, alphabet "E" has been indicated. The same stipulation is made in respect of many other students in the same list, whereas there is a different indication of alphabet "R" as against other students at the same page.

3. Submission is that the petitioner was never enrolled in the University, rather she projected herself as a regular student based upon the documents forwarded by the college and her status was indicated as an ex-student.

Reference has also been made to the writ petition and review petition filed before the Lucknow Bench, and the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the institution, particularly para 4 thereof appended at page 98 of the paper book where the entry of the petitioner, in connivance with Office Superintendent of the college, has been indicated.

4. Reference to a decided petition being Writ C No.- 40139 of 2024 has also been made, particularly the order dated 17.08.2005 passed therein.

5. In sum and substance, the claim of the petitioner *qua* valid admission has been denied.

6. However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that various documents on record clearly indicate that petitioner was duly enrolled as a student in the University and, therefore, non-declaration of her result of B.Ed. is an arbitrary action.

7. The matter cannot be decided, unless the institution makes its stand clear. Though affidavit on behalf of the institution has been filed, however learned counsel Sri Saurabh Srivastava is not present today on account of his engagement in another court.

8. List **peremptorily in top ten** cases on **15.04.2026**.

9. The matter shall not be adjourned on the next date fixed.

(Kshitij Shailendra,J.)

March 18, 2026

Prashant D.