



2026:AHC:215385-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

SPECIAL APPEAL DEFECTIVE No. - 353 of 2026

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

University of Allahabad through its Registrar and 4
others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Appellant(s)	:	
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	A.S.G.I., Prashant Singh, Rajiv Singh, S.C., Diptiman Singh

Chief Justice's Court

HON'BLE ARUN BHANSALI, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE KSHITIJ SHAILENDRA, J.

1. Heard the appellant, appearing in person and Shri Diptiman Singh, learned counsel appearing for the respondent-University of Allahabad.
2. The present intra-court appeal raises challenge to the order dated 15.10.2025, whereby learned Single Judge has disposed of Writ-C No. 4966 of 2025 filed by the appellant denying reliefs claimed in the writ petition, however, with an observation that in case the appellant's marks-sheet is withheld without any sufficient reason, the same shall be provided to him and he may be allowed to appear either in supplementary or in fresh examination to be conducted in the year 2026 in terms of regulations of University, if there is no legal impediment.
3. The appeal is reported to be beyond time by 164 days.
4. An application seeking condonation of delay has been filed and since the same has not been contested by the respondents, we proceed to decide

examinations of B.A. Part-I held in the year 2024, he was declared 'fail', whereafter he did not peruse his studies.

6. The appellant filed writ petition claiming following reliefs:-

"i. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari to quash the impugned first year examination of session 2023-24. And promote petitioner and failed students to second year.

ii. Issue a writ, order or direction, in the nature of mandamus directing University to revise its curriculum and introduce a new curriculum for the courses.

iii. Issue a writ, order or direction in nature of mandamus directing college to renovate the boys hostel of the college and allot it to student.

iv. To appoint an independent committee of retired judges to inquire into and fix the accountability into the systemic failure of classes and for welfare of students.

v. To declare the petitioner is entitled to claim and receive compensation for the mental pain and agony suffered by them on account of due to the violation, failure lachces, inaction/caused and committed by the college and university to tune Rs 5,00,000/- (Rupees Five lakhs only) from college and university to the petitioner.

vi. Issue other appropriate writ order or direction to the respondents as this Honourable High Court deem fits and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case and in the interest of justice and equality"

7. The learned Single Judge, after hearing the appellant in person, disposed of the writ petition by order dated 15.10.2025, which reads as under:-

the same shall be provided to petitioner and he may be allowed to appear either in supplementary or in fresh examination to be conducted in the year 2026, in terms of regulations of University, if there is no legal impediment.

4. With aforesaid observation, the writ petition is disposed of."

8. The appellant has made submissions that the learned Single Judge was not justified in denying the reliefs claimed, particularly when no counter affidavit was filed by the University. Further submission is that the relief granted by the learned Single Judge in para-3 of the order is illusory in nature and could not be granted when the same was not even prayed for. It has further been argued that the University did not follow the guidelines issued by the University Grants Commission ('UGC') regarding teaching curriculum, holding of examinations and award of marks etc and, therefore, as the issues raised in the writ petition having not been decided by the learned Single Judge, the order impugned deserves to be set aside.

9. Per contra, learned counsel for the University has made submissions that the appellant is a habitual litigant and earlier he filed a writ petition raising grievance regarding non-issuance of marks-sheet, which petition was disposed of by issuing a direction to the University to handover the marks-sheet to him and when, in a contempt petition arising from the order of the writ court, the factum of issuance of marks-sheet to the appellant was brought to the notice of the Court, the contempt application was disposed of.

10. Further submission has been made that the reliefs claimed by the appellant in the writ petition were thoroughly misconceived and though

11. It has also been submitted that the appellant also filed a writ petition claiming Rs. 10 lakh as compensation and the Court, in every matter agitated by the appellant, asked him not to indulge in such frivolous litigations and focus on his academics but he never cared even for the suggestions of this Court.

12. Lastly, it has been submitted that the learned Single Judge has not erred in refusing to grant reliefs, rather he took a very lenient view in favour of the appellant as indicated in paragraph-3 of the order which relief itself was not available to the appellant.

13. We have considered the submissions made and have perused the material available on record.

14. A bare perusal of the six reliefs claimed in the writ petition would reveal that the same infact do not relate to any grievance of the appellant, except part of the first prayer, wherein he prayed for a direction to promote him along with failed students to second year. The other reliefs claimed are quite general and vague in nature and, in the opinion of the Court, the same could not at all be claimed by the appellant, who had failed in B.A. Part-I and never studied further.

15. Though the Court finds that no relief was claimed by the appellant regarding issuance of marks-sheet to him which otherwise has already been issued to him and has also been filed along with this appeal, the learned Single Judge was considerate enough in issuing a direction granting permission to the appellant to appear either in supplementary or in fresh examination to be conducted in 2026 subject to legal impediment

appear to go ahead with his studies, rather he appears to be more happy in get himself indulged in such activities, which are other than related to academics. The pleadings include various suggestions which the appellant keeps on making i.e. maintaining proper facilities of water, light, toilet, start of new carrier-oriented courses, timely admissions, availability of books in Library, maintaining roads, ICT enabled classrooms, cleaning the classrooms, using digital boards, infrastructural improvements, lack of adequate classrooms, less numbers of office staffs and peon, very old classrooms and infrastructure, stale curriculum etc etc.

17. The appellant has also levelled several allegations against the officials of the University and has also used objectionable language *qua* the learned Single Judge in the memo of appeal, which we do not want to indicate in this order and we, at this point of time, pardon the appellant who is only a 12th pass young boy having no/little knowledge about decorum of court proceedings, though he pretends himself to be smart enough having all knowledge about law and Court proceedings.

18. In any case, we are not inclined to interfere with the order passed by the learned Single Judge.

19. The appeal has no substance; the same is, therefore, **dismissed** with a warning to the appellant not to indulge in filing of frivolous petitions before this Court, else the Court would be compelled to pass orders which may be adverse to the appellant in multiple ways.