



CWP-6769-2025

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

115

CWP-6769-2025

Date of Decision :11.03.2025

Nitin Bansal

...Petitioner

Versus

Panjab University, Chandigarh and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Sukhandeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pranav Chadha, Advocate for respondent-University.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the order/letter dated 16.08.2024 (Annexure P/10) passed by respondent No.2 by which, the legal notice dated 18.07.2024 (Annexure P/9) issued by the petitioner-student, has been replied by the respondent-University with the observation that the relief claimed by the petitioner-student qua the refund of fees cannot be allowed. Hence, it is the prayer of the petitioner that the impugned order dated 16.08.2024 (Annexure P/10) be set aside, with further prayer that the amount of fee paid by the petitioner should be refunded to him.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner-student submits that the petitioner-student had got admission in B. Pharmacy Course in the University Institute of Pharmaceuticals Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh under the NRI quota in the year 2021 but thereafter, after



CWP-6769-2025

-2-

attending the online classes for the 1st year, the petitioner-student decided to withdraw his admission from the said course and claimed the refund of admission fees on the ground that as the petitioner did not study for the whole course, the respondent-University was not liable to retain the admission fees, which the petitioner had submitted with the University at the time of seeking admission and hence, the said amount should have been refunded to the petitioner-student rather than declining the claim of the petitioner-student.

3. On advance notice, learned counsel for the respondent-University submits that in case, a candidate does not join in a course that he/she takes admission into and applies for refund of the fees that he/she had deposited with the respondent-University and that too within the limitation period provided, the claim qua such refund can be considered but in the present case, the petitioner had attended the online classes for the B. Pharmacy 1st year and only applied for the refund of the fee deposited by him with the respondent-University after the expiry of limitation period provided for seeking the said refund hence, the claim of the petitioner has rightly been rejected by the respondent-University.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

5. Once, it is a conceded fact before this Court that the petitioner applied for admission in B-pharmacy course with the respondent-University which was given to him and the petitioner also attended the online classes for the said course. Merely because the petitioner subsequently decided to withdraw from the said course after attending classes for 1st year does not



CWP-6769-2025

-3-

mean that fees which the petitioner had submitted is to be refunded to him by respondent-University unless and until there exists such rule which underpins the claim of petitioner qua the refund of the fees.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to point out any such rule, which provides that even after attending online classes for a course, in case, a candidate withdraws his admission from such course, the fee is to be refunded to him/her.

7. Even otherwise, whenever a candidate does not join the course which he/she has taken admission into, a limitation period is provided to seek refund for the fees that the candidate has deposited, which limitation period had already expired in the case of the petitioner.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances recorded hereinbefore, as no perversity has been pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioner in the impugned order, no ground for interference by this Court is made out and the writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

March 11, 2025
aarti

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No