

ITEM NO.1

COURT NO.8

SECTION PIL

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G SI.A. Nos.75, 87-89 in Writ Petition(C) No. 142/2006

VIPLAV SHARMA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(for directions and office report)

Date : 19/09/2014 This application was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPAK MISRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAMAJIT SENFor Petitioner(s) Mr. Sanjay R. Hegde, Adv.
Mr. S. Nithin, Adv.
Mr. Anil Kumar Mishra-I, Adv.For Respondent(s) Mr. Harish N. Salve, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Dhruv Mehta, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Abhishek Puri, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Venkatesh Mahadevan, Adv.
Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, Adv.
Mr. K. Kumaresh Babu, Adv.
Ms. Srishti Govil, Adv.
Mr. Mayank Kshirasagar, Adv.
Ms. Vaishali Dixit, Adv.
Ms. Vaishnavi Subrahmanyam, Adv.UGC Mr. Manoj Ranjan Sinha, Adv.
Mr. T. Mahipal, Adv.Mr. P.H. Parekh, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Deepak Kanwar, Adv.
Mr. Ranjan Kumar Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Sandeep Bisht, Adv.
Mr. Sudhir Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Charit Mohan, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Dhar, Adv.
Mr. S.S. Rawat, Adv.
M/s. Parekh & Co.Mr. B. A. Rao, Sr. Adv.
Mr. G. Ramakrishna Prasad, Adv.

Mr. Irshad Ahmad, AAG
Mr. M.R. Shamshad, Adv.
Mr. Zaki Ahmad Khan, Adv.

Mr. R.S. Suri, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Chanchal K. Ganguli, Adv.

Mr. P. Venkat Reddy, Adv.
Mr. Sumanth Nookala, Adv.
M/s. Venkat Palwai Associates

Mr. G. Umapathy, Adv.
Mr. Rakesh Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Shashank Shekhar, Adv.
Mr. Navin Prakash, Adv.

Mr. Ganesh Kamath, Adv.
Mrs. Gunjan S. Jain, Adv.
M/s. M.V. Kini Associates

Mr. K.K. Mani, Adv.
Ms. T. Archana, Adv.

Mr. Vivek Singh, Adv.

Mr. Mahender Jeet Singh, Adv.

Mr. Ranjan Kumar Pandey, Adv.

Mr. Guntur Pramod Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Guntur Prabhakar, Adv.

Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Amandeep Kaur, Adv.
Mr. Prateek Bhatia, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

IA No. 75/2014

List after four weeks.

IA No. 89.2014

Mr. Harish Salve and Mr. Dhruv Mehta, learned senior counsel for the applicant have referred us to Clause 4.16

of the UGC (Institutions Deemed to be Universities) Regulations, 2010, which reads as follows:

"4.0 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR AN INSTITUTION TO BE DECLARED AS AN INSTITUTION DEEMED TO BE UNIVERSITY

b) Conditions

4.16. There shall be a mandatory intensive external review of every deemed to be university in every five years based on the criteria prescribed by the Commission from time to time. (*emphasis added*)"

It is submitted by the learned counsel for the applicant that on a perusal of aforesaid Regulation, it is vivid that there has to be physical inspection of the institution and not to scrutinise the photographs as a substitute for inspection to arrive at any conclusion. Learned counsel appearing for the UGC did not dispute that they have not gone for physical inspection.

Whether physical inspection is a must or not shall be adverted to on 23.09.2014. Learned counsel for the UGC shall obtain instructions and, if necessary, file an affidavit in this regard.

List on 23.09.2014.

IA No. 87/2014

List on 23.09.2014.

(NAVEEN KUMAR)
COURT MASTER

(RENUKA SADANA)
COURT MASTER