IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.20039 of 2026
Date of Decision: 5.11.2026

Rishabh Sharma

.....Petitioner

Versus

Manav Bharti University and Ors.

.....Respondents

Coram
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Mr. Karun Negi and Mr. Somesh Sharma, Advocates.

For the Respondents: Ms. Kanta Thakur, Advocate, for respondent No.1.
Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for respondents No. 2 & 3.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Notice. Ms. Kanta Thakur, learned counsel and Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, appear and waive service of notice on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2 & 3, respectively.

2. In view of the grievances, documents appended alongwith the writ petition and nature of order being passed hereinafter, reply of the writ petition is not required to be called from the respondents. The matter has accordingly been heard.

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 06/11/2026 10:11:45 :::CIS

3. The case set up by the petitioner is that he successfully pursued the Bachelors in Hotel and Tourism Management from respondent No. 1–University under a specific registration number. His name appeared in the student registration as well as in the admission record. The University has also issued detailed marks cards to the petitioner for all the semester' examinations. The petitioner has also appended his detailed marks cards as Annexure P-I (colly). It is further the case of the petitioner that though, in the gazette, the marks secured by him in 3rd Semesters show word "pass" instead of total marks and in 5th Semester, total marks are not mentioned in the Gazette, in 8th Semester, result is not available as per DMC issued for 1st Semester and marks of 2nd Semester are mismatching. Petitioner has been shown as qualified candidate in the 8th Semester's detailed marks card, whereas in accordance with applicable ordinance, petitioner's marks should have been mentioned as per gazette.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner made a request to the respondent-University for rectifying the errors. The same was considered by the Committee duly constituted by the Government for verifying the record and supplying photocopies of relevant documents under the custody of SIT under the Chairmanship of Superintendent of Police, District Solan.

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 06/11/2026 10:11:45 :::CIS

5. Petitioner was eventually supplied the information vide office verification order dated 5.09.2026 (Annexure P-3) by the respondent-University of there being a mismatch as noticed above. Petitioner seeks direction to the respondents for carrying out the correction in the mismatch of green sheet and gazette of his 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th and 8th Semester examination and further direction to the respondents to issue him corrected record.

6. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 stated that correction, if any, is to be done as per the Gazette only.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the issue involved in this writ petition is now squarely covered in CWP No. 2690 of 2024, , titled as **Priya Thakur Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others**, decided on 22.4.2025, whereunder, in similar circumstances, petitioner therein was permitted to move appropriate application before the learned Trial Court where the mark sheet in original stood deposited and on receipt of such application, learned Trial Court was to pass appropriate orders. Relevant portion from the said decision reads as under:-

> "5. In the light of the fact that the relevant correction, if ordered, has to be carried out in the original record, which is presently lying with the learned Trial Court, this Court is of the considered view that it would be in the interest of justice, in case, the petitioner is granted permission to move an application to this effect before the learned

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 06/11/2026 10:11:45 :::CIS

Trial Court, which in the light of the contents of the application, may pass appropriate order thereupon.

6.Ms. Tanu Sharma, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2, has also apprised the Court that as far as the role of respondent No.2 in this writ petition is concerned, it is very limited. Once the Degree of the petitioner is verified by the University concerned, it is only thereafter that the petitioner can approach respondent No.2 for her registration and the registration will be if the petitioner satisfies the statutory provisions of the Act concerned.

7.In the light of the above observations, this writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to move an appropriate application before the learned Trial Court where the mark-sheets in original stand deposited and on the receipt of any such application, let the learned Trial Court pass appropriate order thereupon. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly."

8. In view of above, without examining the merits of the matter, this writ petition is also disposed of with liberty reserved to the petitioner to move appropriate application before the learned Trial Court where marks sheets in original are lying deposited. In case of moving of such application, the concerned learned Trial Court shall pass appropriate orders thereupon. All rights & contentions of the parties are left open.

Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also to stand disposed of.

November 05, 2026 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
(manjit) **Judge**

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 06/11/2026 10:11:45 :::CIS