

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4725 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.12372/2021]

THE STATE OF UTTARAKHAND & ORS.

APPELLANTS

Vs.

NEETU VERMA & ANR.

RESPONDENTS

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 4734 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) Nos.11688/2021]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4735 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.12069/2021]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4736 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.11687/2021]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4737 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.11771/2021]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4738 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.11785/2021]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4739 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.11756/2021]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4740 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.11702/2021]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4741 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No. 11778/2021]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4742 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.11789/2021]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4743 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.13512/2021]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4744 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.2976/2022]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4745 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.2978/2022]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4746 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.2973/2022]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4747 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.2977/2022]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4748 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.2975/2022]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4749 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.2979/2022]

O R D E R

1. These appeals are at the instance of the State of Uttarakhand against the Division Bench judgment of the High Court of Uttarakhand. The respondent - students got admission in MBBS Course against 15% seats reserved for All-India quota in the Government Medical College, Srinagar, Garhwal, Uttarakhand. It is not in dispute that the respondent - students were admitted pursuant to the All-India Pre-Medical/Pre-Dental Entrance Examination 2011. It is stated that clause 5(ii) of the information Bulletin published for the said examination, expressly stipulated that any State condition pertaining to execution of bond to serve rural area would not be applicable to the All-India quota candidates.

2. Be that as it may, the State of Uttarakhand issued Government Order No.943/XXVIII on 23.07.2008 regarding the fee structure for admission to its above-mentioned Government Medical College. It was decided that 15 seats will be reserved for NRI candidates and the fees was fixed at Rs.6 lakhs per annum. The fees for the remaining 85

seats was fixed at Rs.15,000/- per annum. It was also stipulated that the subsidized fee was prescribed as the students on completion of MBBS course would have to serve in the inaccessible/extremely inaccessible hilly areas government hospitals for five years. It was further stipulated that if anyone wanted to wriggle out of the bond, such student would have to pay a one-time amount of Rs.30 lakhs to the State.

3. The G.O. dated 23.07.2008 was amended on 04.08.2008 to the extent that out of 100 seats, 15 seats were ordered to be reserved for the All-India quota. In other words, the All-India quota to the extent of 15 seats was not conceptualized when the policy decision through G.O. dated 23.07.2008 was taken.

4. Thereafter, the Government issued another G.O. dated 09.09.2009 stating that the All-India quota students also would have to sign and execute the above-mentioned bond for 5 years for which they would also be charged subsidized fee of Rs.15,000/- per annum. It was further stated that if they did not sign the bond, such students would be charged Rs.2.20 or Rs.4 lakhs per annum, as the case may be.

5. The above-mentioned G.O. dated 09.09.2009 was challenged before the High Court in Writ Petition No.1845/2009 and its implementation was stayed after taking notice of the fact that the students, who laid

challenge, were admitted to All-India quota seats much before G.O. dated 09.09.2009 was issued.

6. The above-stated writ petition was eventually allowed on 09.04.2015 holding that the G.O. dated 09.09.2009 was inapplicable in the case of the writ petitioners as they were admitted against All-India quota seats in August 2009, i.e., before the said G.O. came into force.

7. Adverting to the respondent - students herein, as noticed at the outset, they got admission pursuant to the 2011 examination. The G.O. dated 09.09.2009 was already in force when they got admission. They too, however, challenged the condition of executing the bond to serve in the inaccessible/extremely inaccessible hilly areas of the State for five years primarily relying upon the previous decision of the High Court dated 09.04.2015 rendered in the case of the students of August 2009 batch. A learned Single Judge of the High Court allowed the writ petition of 2011 batch also vide judgment dated 13.11.2018.

8. The State of Uttarakhand being aggrieved filed an Intra-Court appeal, which has been substantially allowed by a Division Bench of the High Court vide impugned judgment dated 31.07.2019. The High Court *inter alia* has held that:

(i) The respondent - students were admitted to MBBS

Course in 2011-2012 and 2013-2014, thus, they were aware of G.O. dated 09.09.2009.

(ii) These students could not claim parity with the students who were admitted in August 2009 and in whose favour the earlier judgment dated 09.04.2015 was rendered.

(iii) The respondent - students were obligated to ascertain the fee structure in the college, or the condition regarding execution of bond, before exercising their option for admission to the college.

(iv) The respondent - students, after executing the bond and completing their MBBS Course at a concessional rate, could not turn around and contend that they were unaware of differential fee structure or that the State was disabled from recovering the amount from them.

9. The Division Bench of the High Court, finally, allowed the State Appeal in following terms:

"27. Viewed from any angle, we find no illegality in the Government Orders prescribing (i) concessional fee for those who are willing to serve in the hilly and rural areas of the State of Uttarakhand, for a period of five years, after completion of their five years' undergraduate medical course; and (ii) regular fees for those students who did not wish to exercise such an option.

28. While the respondents-writ petitioners cannot be compelled to serve in the hilly and rural areas of the State of Uttarakhand for a period of five years after they had completed their under-graduate course, they would, in case they wish not to render such services, be obligated to pay the regular fee of Rs. 2,20,000/- / Rs. 4,00,000/- per annum, as was

being charged from all other students who were not willing to exercise such an option.

29. xxx xxx xxx

30. In case the respondents-writ petitioners are willing to serve in the hilly and rural areas of the State of Uttarakhand, it is open to them to join duty in terms of the offer of employment to be made by the State Government. In case the respondents-writ petitioners do not wish to exercise such an option, and do not join duty within the time stipulated in the offer to be made by the appellants-State, it is open to the State Government to recover the differential fee amount, (i.e. Rs. 2,20,000 minus Rs. 15,000/- per annum for students who secured admission in the year 2011-12, and Rs. 4,00,000/- minus Rs. 40,000/- per annum for students who secured admission in the year 2013-14), along with interest at 18% per annum."

10. The State of Uttarakhand is still aggrieved and before us claiming that the High Court ought not to have interfered with the bond amount of Rs.30 lakhs recoverable from each of the respondent - students of All-India quota, for their failure to serve the State in the inaccessible/extremely inaccessible hilly areas for five years.

11. We have heard Dr. Abhishek Attre, learned standing counsel for the State of Uttarakhand, learned counsel for the respondent - students as well as Mr. S.D. Sanjay, learned Additional Solicitor General of India on behalf of the Union.

12. Two decisions of this Court have been cited before us, one on behalf of the students and the other on behalf of the State.

13. In Harsh Pratap Sisodia vs. Union of India and others, (1999) 2 SCC 575, relied upon by the respondent - students, a three-Judge Bench of this Court, in no uncertain terms, held as follows:

"5. The eligibility criteria for admission to the medical colleges, throughout the country, under 15% All India Quota, as stipulated by Rule 4.4 of CBSE (information bulletin of 1998) does not show that there is any such requirement as was being raised by the Dean of the Medical College i.e. that the candidate must have passed H.S.C. or its equivalent exam in one and the same attempt. The petitioner had passed his intermediate examination in first division. Later on he also passed the Biology subject in 1994. The petitioner, thus, satisfied the requirements prescribed by Code 02 of Rule 4.4 (iii) of the All India Pre-Medical Examination Rules. The condition imposed by the Maharashtra State, for passing the qualifying examination in one and the same attempt can have no application to the candidates who qualify the entrance examination against 15% All India Quota and are college. allotted a seat in the MBBS against that quota to a medical.

6. It is not disputed that the criteria of eligibility for allotment of seat to MBBS against 15% All India Quota has been fixed by the CBSE in consultation with the Medical Council of India under a modified scheme approved by this Court. Under that scheme the States and Colleges, cannot insist upon, satisfaction of the State requirements as a condition to grant admission to the allottees against 15% All India Quota. It is, therefore, not open to any State to fix any additional eligibility criteria in cases of candidates who fall under 15% All India Quota. The eligibility criteria having been approved by this Court it could not be ignored by the Dean, Medical College, Solapur. The denial of admission to the petitioner was thus wholly illegal and unjustified. Consequently, this writ petition succeeds and is allowed. The Dean, V.M. Medical College, Solapur is, hereby, directed to grant admission to the petitioner in the First Year

of M.B.B.S. course under 15% All India Quota forthwith."

14. On the other hand, learned standing counsel for the State has heavily banked upon a two-Judge Bench decision of this Court in Association of Medical Super Specialty Aspirants and Residents and others vs. Union of India and others, (2019) 8 SCC 607, wherein this Court held as follows:

"17. Schedule VII List I Entry 66 to the Constitution refers to coordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions. Entry 25 of List III of the 7th Schedule deals with education, including technical education, medical education and universities, subject to the provisions of entries 63, 64, 65 and 66 of List I. Legislations can be made by the State Legislature relating to medical education subject to the legislation made by the Parliament. The Medical Council of India Act governs the field of medical education in this country. Admittedly, there is no provision in the Medical Council of India Act touching upon the subject matter of compulsory bonds. Therefore, the States are free to legislate on the subject matter of medical bonds. Executive authority of the State Government is co-extensive with that of the legislative power of the State Legislature. Even in the absence of any legislation, the State Government has the competence to issue executive orders under Article 162 of the Constitution on matters over which the State legislature has the power to legislate. The Notifications issued by the State Governments imposing a condition of execution of compulsory bonds at the time of admission to post-graduate courses and superspeciality courses cannot be said to be vitiated due to lack of authority or competence. The field of bonds requiring compulsory employment is not covered by any Central Legislation. Therefore, the submissions made on behalf of the Appellants that the

States lacked competence to issue the notifications as the field is occupied are rejected.

18. The appellants are aggrieved by the decision of the State Governments imposing conditions for their admission in the post-graduate courses and superspeciality courses. According to them, the State Governments have understood the decision of this Court in Harsh Pratap Sisodia (supra) to be a restraint on the exercise of their power in matters relating to eligibility criteria for admission to medical course. Suddenly, the introduction of the compulsory bonds after 15 years of the judgment in Harsh Pratap Sisodia (supra) is the result of decision taken by the State Governments which is dubbed by the Appellants as arbitrary. This Court in Harsh Pratap Sisodia (supra) was concerned with the additional eligibility criteria being introduced by the State Governments for the 15% All India Quota students. The decision taken by the State Governments to impose a condition of compulsory bond for admission to post-graduate courses and superspeciality is on the basis of relevant material. Huge infrastructure has to be developed and maintained for running medical colleges with post-graduate and superspeciality courses. The amount of fees charged from the students is meagre in comparison to the private medical colleges. Reasonable stipend has to be paid to the doctors. Above all, the State Governments have taken into account the need to provide health care to the people and the scarcity of super specialists in their States. Consequently, a policy decision taken by the State Governments to utilize the services of doctors who were beneficiaries of Government assistance to complete their education cannot be termed arbitrary."

15. The two-Judge Bench thereafter delved into the issue of reasonableness while considering challenge to a compulsory bond which required a service of one year in the State or payment of Rs.10 lakhs in default thereof and thus concluded as follows:

"19.....The basis for the submission is that they have already served the society by working in Government hospitals while undergoing their course. Further conditions imposed on them would impede the progress of their careers. Restrictions placed on their choice of place of work are also unreasonable according to them. An alternate submission made by the counsel appearing for the Appellants is that the imposition of the condition of compulsory bond should be reasonable and the exit clause should be relaxed. Notifications issued by the State Governments imposing a condition of compulsory service and a default clause are per se not unreasonable. However, we are in agreement with the learned counsel for the doctors that the period of compulsory service and the exit should be reasonable. The State Governments and the Armed Forces Medical College are directed to consider imposing the condition of compulsory service period of two years in default of which the Doctors shall recompense the Government by paying Rs.20 lakhs."

16. The Bench then concluded as follows:

"40. The upshot of the above discussion is that the Writ Petitions and the Appeals deserve to be dismissed. Consequently, all the Doctors who have executed compulsory bonds shall be bound by the conditions contained therein."

17. After a thoughtful consideration of the rival submissions, we find that the three-Judge Bench in Harsh Pratap Sisodia (supra) considered the lack of power of a State Government to prescribe additional eligibility conditions in respect of the candidates who are admitted to MBBS course against the 15% All-India quota. The said

three-Judge Bench decision has been duly noticed by the two-Judge Bench in Association of Medical Superspeciality Aspirants (supra), as may be seen from paragraph 18 of the judgment as reproduced above.

18. On a plain reading of the entire judgment, we have not been able to lay our hands on any specific finding returned by this Court in Association of Medical Superspeciality Aspirants (supra) on the power of the State Government to impose additional conditions on the students admitted against 15% All-India quota. With utmost respect at our command, we are bound by the dictum of the three-Judge Bench in Harsh Pratap Sisodia (supra).

19. Following the principles laid down therein, we have no reason to doubt that the view taken by the Division Bench of the High Court is partly erroneous. The question that ought to have been considered by the High Court was whether the State could through its G.O. dated 09.09.2009 impose the condition of serving in the inaccessible/extremely inaccessible hilly areas even on the students who are admitted to MBBS course against 15% All-India quota. While analysing such questions, some hypothetical eventualities ought to have been considered by a Court. For instance, a meritorious student from a southern state will have no difficulty in pursuing his MBBS course in a Government Medical College located in North India, as the entire course curriculum will be

imparted in English language and the peers will also be well-conversant with that language. However, the situation may be entirely different if such MBBS graduates are asked to serve in a Government Hospital located in a remote rural area of a northern state? There is every likelihood of there being some gap in communication between the doctor and patient in such an eventuality. While it is highly desirable laudable in the interest of national integrity to introduce the concept of service outside the home State, it would necessitate a policy decision after due deliberation amongst all stakeholders and specialists throughout the country. A uniform policy decision for which the Union of India may have to take the lead role, can effectively resolve this quandary.

20. At this stage, we may, however, hasten to add that the High Court to the extent of declining the benefit of concessional fee to the students admitted against All-India quota was justified. It emerges from the record that the concessional fee of Rs.15,000/- per annum was payable subject to the condition of execution of bond of serving the State for five years. If a student, admitted against All-India quota, was not willing to serve the State for five years, such student was liable to pay the fees at the rate of Rs.2.20 lakhs or Rs.4 lakhs per annum, as the case maybe. The direction issued by the High Court to the respondent - students to pay the annual fee at the rate of

2.20 lakhs or Rs.4 lakhs per annum is, thus, based upon correct reading of the State Policy on fee structure. We, therefore, see no reason to interfere with the same.

21. The respondent - students are meritorious candidates, who competed in an All-India examination and secured their admission on merit. They were financially assisted by their parents and family to pursue the medical courses. Even if they committed a mistake in executing the bond and paid fees at a subsidized rate of Rs.15,000/- or Rs. 40,000 per annum, the bond itself gave an exit door to them to wriggle out of its consequences by paying the annual fee at the rate of Rs.2.20 lakhs or Rs.4 lakhs, as directed by the High Court also. Since the respondent - students paid that fee at a belated stage they are certainly liable to compensate the State with some interest.

22. Keeping all the attending circumstances in view, the Authorities of the Medical College are directed to calculate the interest payable by each student admitted against All-India quota at the rate of 18% per annum on the delayed payment of fee of Rs.2.20 lakhs or Rs.4 lakhs per annum. It is directed that the Authorities of the Medical College will be at liberty to display the orders on the website and that shall be taken as a communication to each student. The respondent - students shall be liable to pay the arrears, along with interest, within four

months from the date of communication of such order. In the event of any delay, the State shall be at liberty to recover penal interest as may be decided by the executing court.

23. For the reasons aforestated, we do not find any merit in the State appeals, which are, accordingly, dismissed.

24. However, there being arguable issues, pertaining to the powers and the extent of exercise of such power by the State in respect of a student admitted in the State-owned Government Medical College under the All-India quota, the question of law is kept open, which can be examined threadbare in an appropriate case.

.....J.
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.
(NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH)

NEW DELHI;
APRIL 21, 2025

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 4726-4731 OF 2025
[ARISING OUT OF SLP(C) NOS.11431-11436/2021]

ROSHINA NAEEM

APPELLANT

Vs.

STATE OF UTTARAKHAND

RESPONDENT

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 4732-4733 OF 2025
[Arising out of SLP(C) Nos.11084-11085/2021]

O R D E R

1. We find that the above appeals are filed by the students who are admitted against the State quota. The principles or the analogy of the students admitted against All-India quota cannot be applied in their case. However, the High Court has not dealt with their cases on merits.

2. Consequently, in the interest of justice and to be fair to both sides, the impugned judgments of the High Court qua these appeals are set aside and these matters are remitted to the High Court for afresh adjudication. The parties shall be at liberty to request the High Court to fix an early date for final hearing.

3. The principal amount, as was directed by the High Court, has been deposited with the Medical College. The question of their liability to pay the bond amount shall, however, be determined by the High Court. In view of the

matter being remanded to the High Court, we direct the principal amount deposited with the Medical College to be transferred to the Registry of the High Court. The release of the amount so deposited shall depend on the outcome of the matter. The question of their liability to pay the bond amount shall, however, be determined by the High Court.

4. The appeals are, accordingly, disposed of.

.....J.
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.
(NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH)

NEW DELHI;
APRIL 21, 2025

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Civil Appeal No(s). 4725/2025

THE STATE OF UTTARAKHAND & ORS.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

NEETU VERMA & ANR.

Respondent(s)

[FOR ORDERS/DIRECTIONS]

IA No. 67884/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

WITH

C.A. No. 4726-4731/2025 (X)

(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 87446/2021

FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 87447/2021

IA No. 87446/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 87447/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4732-4733/2025 (X)

(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 84683/2021

FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 84686/2021

FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 93167/2022

IA No. 84683/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 84686/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 93167/2022 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4734/2025 (X)

(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 90594/2021

FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 90595/2021

FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT ON IA 36916/2022

IA No. 36916/2022 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT

IA No. 90595/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 90594/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4735/2025 (X)

(IA FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 93605/2021

FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 93606/2021

IA No. 93606/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 93605/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4736/2025 (X)
(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 90579/2021
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 90580/2021
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT ON IA 40005/2022
IA No. 40005/2022 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT
IA No. 90579/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT
IA No. 90580/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4737/2025 (X)
(IA FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 91455/2021
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 91456/2021
IA No. 91456/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT
IA No. 91455/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4738/2025 (X)
(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 91637/2021
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 91640/2021
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT ON IA 36913/2022
IA No. 36913/2022 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT
IA No. 91640/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT
IA No. 91637/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4739/2025 (X)
(IA FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 91278/2021
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 91281/2021
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT ON IA 36925/2022
IA No. 36925/2022 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT
IA No. 91281/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT
IA No. 91278/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4740/2025 (X)
(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 90688/2021
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 90689/2021
IA No. 90689/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT
IA No. 90688/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4741/2025 (X)
(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 91567/2021
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 91568/2021
IA No. 91568/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT
IA No. 91567/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4742/2025 (X)
(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 91631/2021
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA
91632/2021
IA No. 91632/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED
JUDGMENT
IA No. 91631/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4743/2025 (X)
(IA FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 102739/2021
IA No. 102739/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4744/2025 (X)
(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 169174/2021
FOR APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL
VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT ON IA 169175/2021
IA No. 169175/2021 - APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL
VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT
IA No. 169174/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4745/2025 (X)
(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 168810/2021
FOR APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL
VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT ON IA 168811/2021
IA No. 168811/2021 - APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL
VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT
IA No. 168810/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4746/2025 (X)
(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 166626/2021
FOR APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL
VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT ON IA 166627/2021
IA No. 166627/2021 - APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL
VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT
IA No. 166626/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4747/2025 (X)
(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 169154/2021
FOR APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL
VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT ON IA 169155/2021
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 195070/2022
IA No. 169155/2021 - APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL
VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT
IA No. 169154/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.
IA No. 195070/2022 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4748/2025 (X)
(IA FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 166849/2021
FOR APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL
VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT ON IA 166851/2021
IA No. 166851/2021 - APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL
VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT
IA No. 166849/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

C.A. No. 4749/2025 (X)

(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 167924/2021
FOR APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL
VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT ON IA 167932/2021
IA No. 167932/2021 - APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL
VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT
IA No. 167924/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date : 21-04-2025 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Atul Sharma, AOR

Mr. Abhishek Atrey, AOR
Ms. Rachna Gandhi, Adv.
Ms. Ambika Atrey, Adv.
Ms. Jyoti Verma, Adv.
Mr. Navneet Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Sanpreet Singh Ajmani, AOR
Mr. Jitendra Mohan Sharma Senior Advocate
Mr. Amitoz Kaur Adv, Adv.
Mr. Amit Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Sandeep Malik, Adv.

Ms. Manju Jetley, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Dr. Sushil Balwada, AOR
Mr. Ajit Kumar Thakur, Adv.
Mr. Ram Nath, Adv.
Ms. Kiran Singh, Adv.

Mr. Praveen Jain, AOR
Mr. Siddharth Jain, Adv.

Ms. Vanshaja Shukla, AOR
Ms. Ankeeta Appanna, Adv.
Ms. Rachna Gandhi, Adv.

Mr. Abhishek Atrey, AOR

Ms. Gargi Srivastava, Adv.
Mr. Arpit Shukla, AOR
Mr. Dinesh Bahadur Singh, Adv.
Ms. Garima Srivastava, Adv.

Mr. S.D. Sanjay, A.S.G.
Mr. Akshay Amritanshu, Adv.
Mr. Siddhant Kohli, Adv.

Mr. Aaditya Dixit, Adv.
Ms. Sweksha, Adv.
Mr. Purnendu Bajpai, Adv.
Mr. Sudarshan Lamba, AOR
Ms. Parthvi Ahuja, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Civil Appeal No. 4725 Of 2025, Civil Appeal Nos. 4734 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4735 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4736 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4737 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4738 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4739 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4740 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4741 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4742 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4743 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4744 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4745 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4746 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4747 Of 2025, Civil Appeal No. 4748 Of 2025 and Civil Appeal No. 4749 Of 2025

The appeals are dismissed in terms of the signed order.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

Civil Appeal Nos. 4726-4731 Of 2025 and Civil Appeal Nos. 4732-4733 Of 2025

The appeals are disposed of in terms of the signed order.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(NITIN TALREJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI T.C.)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(Signed order is placed on the file)