

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI

WRIT PETITION No.21904 of 2026

08 JULY, 2026

Between:

S.Nandini

... Petitioner

AND

NALSAR University of Law

...Respondent

: O R D E R :

This Writ Petition is filed seeking the following relief:

"... to issue a Writ or order preferably in the nature of Writ of Mandamus by declaring the action of the Respondents in refusing to issue the Hall Ticket to the Petitioner and consequently preventing her from appearing for the First Year MBA Semester-II Supplementary Examinations commencing from 06.07.2026 and compelling her to repeat the entire First Year MBA Programme, despite the Petitioner's genuine medical illness duly established by authentic medical records and despite the statutory provisions recognising medical leave and relaxation in deserving cases, as illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, discriminatory, violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India, contrary to Regulations 4.4, 4.6, 4.8.1, 4.8.2, 4.8.3, 4.8.4, 4.8.5, 4.8.7, 5.2.6 and 5.6 governing the MBA Programme, and consequently direct the Respondents to forthwith issue the Hall Ticket to the Petitioner and permit her to appear in the remaining First Year MBA Semester-II Supplementary Examinations scheduled to be held on 09.07.2026, 10.07.2026 and 13.07.2026, evaluate her answer scripts, declare her results and, if declared successful, promote her to the Second Year MBA Programme with all consequential academic benefits, without insisting upon repetition of the First Year, and to pass..."

2. Heard Mr. Dr.Lakshmi Narasimha, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. A.Kranti Kumar Reddy, learned Standing Counsel

for NALSAR University, appearing for the respondent. Perused the record.

3. Brief facts of the case:

3.1. The petitioner is a bonafide first year student pursuing MBA in the respondent-University and she has successfully completed her first semester with a CGPA of 7.60. During the second semester in the months of February and March, 2026, she suffered from serious medical ailments, including viral pneumonia, Lower Respiratory Tract Infection (LRTI), severe dehydration, persistent fever, productive cough, chills, rigors and repeated vomiting, for which she underwent treatment at the NALSAR Health Centre as well as Princess Durru Shehvar Children's and General Hospital, Hyderabad and was advised complete bed rest for nearly twenty days. Owing to the said illness, she could not maintain the prescribed attendance and was consequently not permitted to appear for the II Semester End-Term Examinations conducted in the month of April, 2026. Immediately, after recovery, the petitioner resumed her academic activities.

3.2. On a representation submitted by the petitioner's parents explaining her medical condition, seeking condonation of the shortage of attendance and tendering an unconditional apology for

not having obtained prior permission for medical leave in accordance with the prescribed procedure, the Head of the Department of Management Studies (DoMS) initially assured the petitioner that she would be permitted to appear for the Supplementary/Repeat Examinations scheduled to be held in the month of July, 2026. However, on 04.07.2026, she was informed that as her backlogs exceeded four subjects, she was required to repeat the entire first year MBA programme. Subsequently, after commencement of the supplementary examinations on 06.07.2026, the respondent-University declined to issue hall ticket to the petitioner on the ground that she had been detained from appearing in the End-Term Examinations due to shortage of attendance and having backlogs in more than four subjects and therefore she was not eligible to appear for the supplementary examinations and was required to re-register for the entire first year MBA programme in accordance with the Manual of Policies for MBA (hereinafter referred to as the 'Rules/Policies').

3.3. Challenging the said action as arbitrary, illegal and contrary to the Rules, the petitioner approached this Court by filing the present writ petition, seeking a direction to the respondent-University to permit her to appear for the remaining supplementary examinations scheduled to be held on 09.07.2026, 10.07.2026 and 13.07.2026.

4. Submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner:

4.1. The Rules of the respondent-University recognizes medical leave and provide for relaxation in attendance in genuine medical cases, subject to fulfillment of prescribed conditions. The Rules contemplate consideration of medical certificates by the Examination Committee and confer discretion upon the competent authorities to grant appropriate relief in genuine cases. The very object of incorporating medical leave is to ensure that students suffering from bonafide medical ailments are not deprived of their academic pursuits solely on account of circumstances beyond their control. However, the respondent-University has adopted a hyper technical approach by refusing to exercise the discretion vested in it.

4.2. Owing to the petitioner's serious illness during February and March, 2026, she could not maintain the requisite attendance and was consequently not permitted to appear for the II Semester End-Term Examinations conducted between 21.04.2026 and 28.04.2026. Thereafter, although supplementary examinations were notified from 06.07.2026 to 13.07.2026 and the Head of the Department had initially assured the petitioner that she would be permitted to appear for the said examinations, the respondent, after commencement of the examinations on 06.07.2026, refused to issue her hall ticket and informed her that having been detained for

shortage of attendance and having four backlogs, she was required to repeat the first year MBA programme. Consequently, the petitioner could not appear in the supplementary examinations held on 06.07.2026, 07.07.2026 and 08.07.2026 and unless immediate relief is granted, she would lose the opportunity to appear in the remaining examinations scheduled on 09.07.2026, 10.07.2026 and 13.07.2026 and thereby lose an academic year.

4.3. Rule 4.4 contemplates relaxation in cases of personal physical exigency, grave personal tragedy or University work and the petitioner's case squarely falls within the category of 'personal physical exigency' as her illness is duly substantiated by medical records. Rule 4.6 prescribes a minimum attendance of 75% is required for a student to appear in the End-Term examinations, but specifically permits a student granted medical leave to appear the said examinations with a minimum attendance of 67%, thereby demonstrating that the attendance requirement is not inflexible. Rule 4.7.2 mandating attendance of 75% for each subject on all days is for End-Term Examinations, but not for supplementary examinations.

4.4. Rules 4.8.1, 4.8.2 and 4.8.3 specifically require consideration of medical certificates, empower the Head of the Department to

grant medical leave and provide for acceptance of certificates issued by the qualified Medical Practitioners in genuine cases. Despite the petitioner producing valid medical certificates and her case being supported by medical evidence, without considering the same or passing any reasoned order or without affording any opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner, the respondent did not permit the petitioner to appear either for the End-Term or Supplementary Examinations,.

4.5. Rule 4.8.7 provides that post facto medical certificates shall not ordinarily be considered, cannot be read in isolation and must be harmoniously construed with Rules 4.4, 4.6, 4.8.2 and 4.8.3, which recognize medical leave, provide for relaxation in personal physical exigency and confer discretion upon the competent authorities. If Rule 4.8.7 is interpreted as an absolute prohibition, it would defeat the very purpose of the provisions relating to medical leave under the Rules.

4.6. As per Rule 4.2, the respondent-University failed to comply with the prescribed procedure of notifying the attendance particulars to the students at regular intervals by displaying the same on the notice board and erroneously recorded absence session-wise instead of subject-wise. The petitioner had 56% attendance and no

proceedings of the Examination Committee rejecting her medical claim were ever communicated. In the absence of any decision by the competent authority, the refusal to issue the hall ticket and not permitting the petitioner to appear in the supplementary examinations is wholly arbitrary, contrary to the Rules and violative of the principles of natural justice.

4.7. Hence, learned counsel prayed this Court to direct the respondent-University to forthwith issue hall ticket to the petitioner and permit her to appear in the remaining II Semester Supplementary Examinations scheduled to be held on 09.07.2026, 10.07.2026 and 13.07.2026, contending that failure to grant such relief would result in the petitioner losing an academic year, despite her bonafide medical condition.

5. Submissions of the learned Standing Counsel for NALSAR University appearing for the respondent:

5.1. Under the Rules, a student is required to maintain a minimum attendance of 75% to be eligible to appear for the End-Term Examinations and even a student granted medical leave is required to secure a minimum attendance of 67%. However, in the present case, the petitioner has not satisfied the prescribed attendance

requirement in any individual subject and has secured only 52% of attendance.

5.2. The attendance particulars were duly displayed on the notice board of the University, but the petitioner did not raise any objection or challenge her detention from appearing in the End-Term Examinations at the relevant point of time. During the relevant period, the petitioner was present in the University campus but did not attend the classes and did not obtain prior permission from the respondent-University for availing medical leave in accordance with the prescribed procedure. In the absence of any prior application seeking medical leave, the competent authority had no occasion to consider the petitioner's claim or to pass any order thereon. Therefore, the petitioner cannot contend that the respondent-University failed to consider her medical condition or communicate any decision in that regard.

5.3. Relying upon Rule 5.3.5, it is submitted that a student, who is detained from appearing in the End-Term Examinations on account of shortage of attendance, is ineligible to appear for the repeat/supplementary examination and is required to re-register for the course.

5.4. When the petitioner was not permitted to appear for the End-Term examinations conducted in April, 2026, on account of shortage of attendance, she ought to have challenged the said decision at the relevant point of time by placing reliance on her medical condition. Instead, the petitioner remained silent and approached this Court by filing the present writ petition only after commencement of the supplementary examinations, that too by way of a lunch motion, seeking permission to appear in the supplementary examinations, contrary to the Rules. Furthermore, the representation submitted by the parents of the petitioner is on 06.07.2026, i.e., after the commencement of the supplementary examinations.

5.5. In view of the Rules followed by the respondent-University, the petitioner cannot be permitted to appear for the supplementary examinations midway and having been detained for shortage of attendance in the End-Term Examinations, she is required to re-register for the course. Hence, he prayed to dismiss the writ petition.

6. For proper adjudication of the matter, it is necessary to extract the Rules 4.6, 4.7.2 and 5.3.5, which read as follows:

“4.6. In any course, to be permitted to take the end-term examination, a candidate should have attended a minimum of 75% of classes. However, a student who has been granted Medical Leave shall be allowed to appear in the End-Term Examination provided he/she has put in

minimum of 67% attendance. The percentage indicated above shall be rounded up to the next whole number. The attendance of students will be reported to the examination section in the prescribed format by the instructors concerned, after completion of each course.

4.7.2. Students shall maintain an attendance of 75% percentage for each subject on all days (including guest sessions on Saturdays or other days) so as to qualify for taking the End Term Examinations.

5.3.5. Once a student is declared as 'Failed (F)' for whatever reason, his/her grade shall carry ® with the grade obtained later. The students who fail to pass any course even after the Repeat Examination has to Re-register for the same course for next year. **Similarly, a student who is not allowed to take End-Term Examination for shortage of attendance will not be allowed for repeat examination. In such a case, student has to re-register for the course, the grade obtained after re-registration will carry ®®."**

7. Having heard the learned counsel appearing on both sides and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is an admitted fact that the petitioner was not permitted to appear for the II Semester End-Term Examinations conducted in April, 2026, on account of shortage of attendance. The petitioner attributes the shortage of attendance to her prolonged illness during February and March, 2026 and has placed on record medical certificates evidencing that she underwent treatment for viral pneumonia, Lower Respiratory Tract Infection (LRTI), severe dehydration and other related ailments. There can be no dispute that illness, if duly established, constitutes a genuine hardship. However, the relief sought by the petitioner has to be examined strictly in the light of the

academic Rules governing the MBA Programme framed and followed by the respondent-University.

8. Rule 4.6 mandates that a student should maintain a minimum of 75% attendance for appearing in the End-Term Examinations. The Rule further provides a limited relaxation in favour of a student granted medical leave by permitting such student to appear for the End-Term Examinations, provided he or she has secured a minimum attendance of 67%. Thus, even in cases of genuine medical illness, the Rules prescribe a mandatory minimum attendance of 67%.

9. In the present case, according to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the attendance of the petitioner is 56%, whereas, it is the contention of the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondent that it is only 52%. Even if the attendance claimed by the petitioner is accepted, she admittedly falls short of the minimum attendance of 67% prescribed under Rule 4.6. As the petitioner did not satisfy the minimum attendance requirement, she was not permitted to appear for the End-Term Examinations.

10. Rule 5.3.5 stipulates that a student, who is not permitted to take End-Term Examinations on account of shortage of attendance, shall not be eligible to appear for the repeat examination and shall

be required to re-register for the course. The Rule is couched in mandatory terms and leaves no discretion either to the respondent-University or to this Court to permit a student detained on account of shortage of attendance to appear in the supplementary examinations. Therefore, once the petitioner was detained from appearing in the End-Term Examinations on account of shortage of attendance, the consequence of her ineligibility to appear in the supplementary examinations necessarily follows.

11. The material available on record further reveals that the petitioner did not obtain prior permission for medical leave in accordance with the prescribed procedure. The representation, dated 06.07.2026, submitted by the petitioner's parents contains an unconditional apology for not obtaining prior permission for medical leave.

12. It is also not in dispute that the petitioner did not challenge the decision detaining her from appearing in the End-Term Examinations conducted in April, 2026. Instead, she approached this Court by filing the present writ petition only after commencement of the supplementary examinations. By the time, the present writ petition, moved by way of a lunch motion, was taken up for consideration, the supplementary examinations scheduled on

06.07.2026, 07.07.2026 and 08.07.2026 had already been concluded. Significantly, the representation, dated 06.07.2026 seeking condonation of shortage of attendance and permission to appear for the supplementary examinations was submitted by the petitioner's parents only on 06.07.2026, on which day, the supplementary examinations had commenced.

13. The material placed before this Court further discloses that the petitioner's parents had already been informed on 04.07.2026 that the petitioner would be required to repeat the First Year MBA Programme. If the petitioner genuinely believed that she was permitted to appear in the supplementary examinations on the assurance of DoMS, nothing prevented her from approaching the competent authorities for issuance of the hall ticket prior to the commencement of the examinations or from challenging the order of detention before the appropriate forum at an appropriate stage.

14. The submission of the petitioner that denial of permission to appear in the supplementary examinations would result in loss of one academic year and financial hardship undoubtedly evokes sympathy. However, sympathy or equitable considerations cannot override the mandatory academic Rules, which are uniformly applicable to all the students. It is well settled that in matters relating

to academic standards, eligibility and examination regulations, the scope of judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is extremely limited. Unless the action of the academic authority is shown to be arbitrary, mala fide, discriminatory or in violation of the governing Rules, this Court cannot interfere or direct the academic body to act contrary to its own Regulations.

15. In view of the above discussion, this Writ Petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

JUVVADI SRIDEVI, J

Date: 08.07.2026
rev