

CNR No: PHHC011421032024

101 CM-12099-CWP-2026 in CWP-28693-2024

AMAN RANI V/S UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

Present: Applicant-petitioner in person.

Mr. Himanshu Malik, Senior Panel Counsel
for the respondent-UIO.

Mr. Indresh Goel, Advocate
for respondents No.4 to 9.

1. This is the second application filed by the petitioner, seeking modification/recalling of the order dated 19.05.2026 passed in CWP-28693-2024.

2. At the outset, we may notice that vide order dated 24.03.2026, on the request of the petitioner, we had appointed a senior advocate to assist this Court on her behalf, as the petitioner otherwise is a practising lawyer before this Court. The petition was allowed vide order dated 19.05.2026 and the petitioner was permitted to submit her synopsis in offline mode within a period of one week, and the University was directed to allow her to pursue the Ph.D. course thereafter, in accordance with law. It may be noticed that the learned counsel for the University took a fair stance and did not dispute the factual assertions, nor raised any serious objection to the relief sought by the petitioner.

3. Since the petitioner had impleaded Professors of the Department of Law, in their personal capacity and made various allegations against them, a specific statement was made by the petitioner on 19.05.2026 that such allegations are not being pressed, and accordingly, all such allegations were expunged from the record. The observations made in paragraph 12 of the order dated 19.05.2026 are relevant, and are reproduced as under:-

“12. Before concluding, we observe that the petitioner while pursuing the writ petition has impleaded Professors in the Department of Law and made various allegations against them. Allegations have also been made against certain other persons. Learned senior counsel representing the petitioner, on the basis of instructions obtained from the petitioner, who is present in Court, states that the allegations made against senior faculty members in the writ petition are not being pressed. Accordingly, all such allegations are expunged from the record.”

4. Before filing the present application, the petitioner filed CM-10161-CWP-2026 seeking modification of the order dated 19.05.2026, however perusal of the contents of the application revealed that several assertions made therein were scandalous and wholly uncalled for, and when confronted with the same, the petitioner who was appearing in person, tendered an unconditional apology and sought permission to withdraw the application with liberty to file a fresh one. Taking a lenient view, and ignoring the vague and uncalled for assertions, this Court permitted the petitioner to withdraw the application with liberty as sought.

5. Despite the fact that the petitioner gave a categorical statement that she will not press the allegations qua the senior faculty members, when the order dated 19.05.2026 was passed, and tendered an unconditional apology regarding the uncalled for allegations made in the earlier application, yet we find that she has again levelled similar allegations in the present application also.

6. As regards the grievance of the petitioner regarding refusal of the officials of the Department of Laws, to accept her synopsis, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-University, has made a specific statement before this Court that not only has her synopsis been accepted, the Department has no objection whatsoever in the continuance of the academic course by her.

7. Notwithstanding such a statement and despite repeated requests by this Court that the petitioner should desist from making uncalled for allegations against senior faculty members, and should pursue her academic course, yet, it appears that the petitioner is only interested in persisting with unwarranted litigation, which is premised on the allegations, not pressed/withdrawn by her earlier.

8. We are, therefore, of the opinion that the petitioner cannot be permitted to abuse the process of the Court, by filing repeated applications, wherein uncalled for allegations against academics/member of the Bar are asserted.

9. In that view of the matter, the present application is dismissed with costs of Rs.25,000/-, which shall be deposited in the PGI Poor Patients Welfare Fund.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

10.08.2026
mohit goyal