

[PRINT / DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

[writ](#) petitioners prayed for extension of time schedule and prayed for the additional counselling. Court negated the same. Court also took the note of the fact that every year large number of non-clinical seats remain vacant because many graduate doctors do not want to do postgraduation in non-clinical subjects. Thereafter, it is observed and held that merely because the seats are lying vacant, is not a ground to grant extension of time and grant further opportunity to fill up vacant seats. It is observed that the schedule must be followed. While holding so, it is observed in paragraph 6 as under: -

“6. In this case the petitioners want a general extension of time not on account of any particular difficulty faced by any individual college or university but generally on the ground that a large number of seats for the PG courses are lying 14 vacant. It is stated that more than 1000 seats are lying vacant. In the affidavit filed by the UOI it is mentioned that as far as deemed universities are concerned there are 603 seats lying vacant. However, it is important to note that out of 603 seats lying vacant only 31 are in clinical subjects and the vast majority (572) that is almost 95% of the seats are lying vacant in non-clinical subjects. There is no material on record to show as to what is the situation with regard to the remaining 400-500 seats. This Court however can take judicial notice of the fact that every year large number of non-clinical seats remain vacant because many graduate doctors do not want to do postgraduation in non-clinical subjects. Merely because the seats are lying vacant, in our view, is not a ground to grant extension of time and grant further opportunity to fill up vacant seats. The schedule must be followed. If we permit violation of schedule and grant extension, we shall be opening a pandora's box and the whole purpose of fixing a time schedule and laying down a regime which strictly adheres to time schedule [will](#) be defeated.”

Education Promotion Society for India v. Union of India, (2019) 7 SCC 38

Tags: [Admission - Education](#)