



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI

Bench
Sr.No:-8
[3584]

WRIT PETITION NO: 13043 of 2025

Dr. U. Anudeep

...Petitioner

Vs.

Dr. N.T.R. University of Health Sciences and others

...Respondent(s)

Advocate for Petitioner:

Mr. Chukka Kranthi Kiran

Advocate(s) for Respondent(s):

Mr. C. V. R.Rudra Prasad – R3,
Mrs. Tata VenkataSridevi, Standing
Counsel for Dr.NTR University of
Health Sciences – R1 & R2

**CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SMT. LISA GILL
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE CHALLA GUNARANJAN**

DATE : 9th July, 2026.

LISA GILL, CJ:

Prayer in this petition reads as under:

“to issue Writ Order or Orders or Directions more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the impugned proceeding NO.6626/EA2/PG/2020, Dated /11/2024 treating the Petitioner as ineligible to continue the PG course, MDS on the ground that the double the duration of the course is completed by May, 2024 albeit the fact that the request for continuation was made through DD No.668065, Dated 07.3.2023 and the letter addressed by the 3rd Respondent to the 2nd Respondent Dated 12.01.2024 for readmission/continuation of the PG, MDS Course as illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional, contrary to the Dental Council of India, Master of Dental Surgery Course Regulation, 2017 and violative of Article 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India and interalia set aside the same by

directing the 2nd Respondent to permit the petitioner to pursue/continue the PG course, MDS and pass such other order or orders as deemed fit and proper according to the facts and circumstances of the case.”

2. Petitioner, after completing his Bachelor of Dental Surgery (B.D.S.) course for the academic years 2012-2017, joined respondent No.3 College on 23.05.2018 in the discipline of Master of Dental Surgery (M.D.S.), which is a three-year course. Petitioner, it is stated, could not complete his 1st year Basic Sciences paper due to reasons beyond his control. Said exam was cleared in the year 2021 after five attempts. Due to this backlog, he could not appear for third-year examinations.

3. Petitioner thereafter also could not attend his daily classes during the year 2022, though he attended some postings/ presentations and seminars in the year 2023. Subsequently, petitioner was not permitted to attend postings for the reason that he did not have requisite attendance. He was advised by respondent No.3, College, to address a letter requesting readmission/ continuation of P.G.Course in terms of Regulation 11.1 of Master of Dental Surgery Course Regulations, 2017. Petitioner submitted Demand Draft dated 07.03.2023, for this purpose, but when no reply was forthcoming, he submitted a representation on 27.06.2024 along with another Demand Draft for Rs.7,000/-. Respondent No.2 University, *vide* impugned communication, dated nil/11/2024, rejected petitioner's request to continue the course as

double the duration of course had already been completed by May 2024. Hence aggrieved present writ petition has been filed.

4. Learned counsel for petitioner vehemently argues that respondents have illegally rejected petitioner's request for continuation of the course, despite petitioner having submitted first Demand Draft on 07.03.2023. Maximum period of six years would come to an end only on 23.05.2024. Therefore, rejection of his request on the ground that it was addressed after period of six years, i.e. on 27.06.2024, is completely unjustified. It is further argued that petitioner had deposited requisite fees, and it was solely due to his ailment (as reflected in the medical prescription/certificate attached along with petition) that he could not complete his further studies. Once demand draft dated 07.03.2023 was submitted, it should by itself be treated to be a request. It is thus prayed that this writ petition be allowed as prayed for.

5. Learned counsel for respondent University has opposed the writ petition, while submitting that in terms of Regulation 11.1, a candidate must complete M.D.S. course within a maximum period of six years from the date of admission. It is stated that petitioner did not attend his P.G. classes regularly; while he had 84% and 87% attendance from June 2018 to May 2019 and June 2019 to May 2020, respectively, his attendance dropped to 39% for the academic year June 2020 to May 2021, and further down to 4% from June 2022 to May 2023. He failed to attend any classes from June 2023 to November 2024. He cleared the M.D.S. Part-I (Basic Sciences Exam) only in

his sixth attempt in the month of December 2021. Mere submission of a demand draft without any request and the purpose thereof can be of no avail to petitioner. It is further explained that three-year M.D.S. course can be completed by a candidate within a maximum period of six years. Therefore, even if the date of his request is deemed to run from the drawing of Demand Draft dated 07.03.2023, he cannot possibly complete the course within the maximum period of six years.

6. Learned counsel for respondent University has further referred to public notice dated 03.06.2026, issued by National Dental Commission, stressing upon strict compliance with provisions of Revised BDS Course (7th Amendment) Regulations, 2015 and Master of Dental Surgery Course Regulations, 2017, regarding completion of courses within the stipulated period. Reference has also been made to judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Siddhant Mahajan v. The State of Rajasthan, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2864**. Dismissal of writ petition is, thus, sought.

7. We have heard learned counsel for parties and have perused the file with their able assistance.

8. The fact that petitioner joined M.D.S. Course on 23.05.2018 is a matter of record, as is his subsequent failure to attend classes regularly or clear the requisite examinations within stipulated period.

9. At this stage, we take note of the argument raised by learned counsel for petitioner that respondent No.3 College had forwarded a communication dated 12.01.2024 to Registrar of respondent University, purportedly forwarding an application of petitioner for re-admission after break of study.

10. It is the specific case of petitioner that respondent University failed to take into consideration the Demand Draft drawn in its favour on 07.03.2023, and only took note of the second Demand Draft dated 25.06.2024.

11. A perusal of writ affidavit and material on record reveals that while drawing Demand Draft dated 07.03.2023, petitioner did not enclose any formal "request letter". Petitioner claims that he was not aware of the procedure to avail of an opportunity to continue with the P.G.Course, and thus had not addressed any letter enclosing Annexures 1 & 2, which could have been done only after respondent No.3 College apprised him. Argument as raised before us and noted in para 9 above, is in direct contradiction to specific pleadings. Respondent University, in its counter-affidavit, has specifically stated that no application was received prior to 27.06.2024. Similarly, respondent College, in counter-affidavit filed on its behalf, stated that it was approached for re-admission only on 25.06.2024 and in the light of DCI Regulations, the request for re-admission was rejected by respondent No.1 University.

12. Be that as it may, it is to be noticed that even if Demand Draft dated 07.03.2023 is considered as a request, which in effect is not possible, petitioner by no stretch of imagination can complete the course within a period

of six years from the date of his admission. His eligibility qua attendance, etc., is also clearly deficient.

13. At this stage, it is useful to refer to Regulation 11(1) of Dental Council of India, Master of Dental Surgery Course Regulations, 2017, which reads as under:

*“11. **Period of Training:-** (1) The period of training for the award of the MDS course shall be of three years duration for three academic years as full time candidates in an institution including the period of examination:*

Provided that the time period required for passing out of the MDS course shall be a maximum of six years from the date of admission in said course.”

(emphasis added)

14. A bare perusal of this Regulation reveals that M.D.S.Course has to be completed by a candidate within a period of six years from the date of admission therein. There is merit in the argument raised by learned counsel for respondents that doing so would be an impossibility insofar as the present petitioner is concerned.

15. Learned counsel for writ petitioner is unable to point out any ground which calls for interference in exercise of writ jurisdiction at this stage.

16. No other argument was raised.

17. Keeping in view facts and circumstances as above, Writ Petition is dismissed.

No costs. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

LISA GILL, CJ.

CHALLA GUNARANJAN, J.

SSN

Whether the order is Speaking/Reasoned : Yes

Whether the order is Reportable : Yes

**HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL, CHIEF JUSTICE
&
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHALLA GUNARANJAN**

Writ Petition No.13043 of 2025

DATE : 09.07.2026

SSN