

2026 SCC OnLine SC 134

In the Supreme Court of India
(BEFORE SURYA KANT, C.J. AND JOYMALYA BAGCHI, J.)

Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s). 101/2026
Mritunjay Tiwari ... Petitioner(s);
Versus
Union of India and Another ... Respondent(s).

(IA No. 27410/2026 - Stay Application)

With

Item No. 35

Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s). 109/2026
(IA No. 28911/2026 - Stay Application)

Item No. 45

Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s). 108/2026
(IA No. 28861/2026 - Grant of Interim Relief)

Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s). 101/2026, IA No. 27410/2026, Writ
Petition(s)(Civil) No(s). 109/2026, IA No. 28911/2026, Writ
Petition(s)(Civil) No(s). 108/2026 and IA No. 28861/2026

Decided on January 29, 2026

Education Law — General Principles of Education Law — Remedies available: Judicial Review/Interference by Court/Consumer Jurisdiction — *University Grants Commission (Promotion of Equity in Higher Education Institutions) Regulations, 2026 — Validity of — Held, there exist prima facie ambiguities and possibility of misuse — Substantial questions of law framed — Regulations, 2026 kept in abeyance — Direction to continue UGC (Promotion of Equity in Higher Education Institutions) Regulations, 2012 till further orders — Constitution of India — Arts. 14, 15, 21 and 142*

In a writ petition challenging the constitutional validity of the University Grants Commission (Promotion of Equity in Higher Education Institutions) Regulations, 2026 (“2026 UGC Regulations”) a Division Bench of Surya Kant, C.J., and Joymalya Bagchi, J., expressed the prima facie concern regarding the definitional scope of “caste-based discrimination” and the possibility of its misuse and referred the matter to 3-Judges Bench with direction to keep the 2026 UGC Regulations in abeyance.

The principal challenge was directed against Clause 3(c) defining “caste-based discrimination”. The petitioners contended that the definition is “restrictive and exclusionary in its formulation” as it renders persons belonging to non-reserved or general categories “completely remediless under the statutory framework”, even if

subjected to caste-based discrimination or institutional bias. The petitioners further argued that the Regulations proceed on an “unfounded presumption that caste-based discrimination is necessarily unidirectional”.

Upon prima facie consideration, the Court noted that “some of the provisions of the Impugned Regulations suffer from certain ambiguities, and the possibility of their misuse cannot be ruled out.” The Court framed following substantial questions of law for examination—

1. *“Whether the incorporation of Clause 3(c) in the Impugned Regulations, defining “Caste-based Discrimination”, bears a reasonable and rational nexus to subserve the object and purpose of the 2026 UGC Regulations, particularly in light of the fact that no distinct or special procedural mechanism has been prescribed to address caste-based discrimination, as opposed to the exhaustive and inclusive definition of “Discrimination” provided under Clause 3(e) of the Impugned Regulations?”*
2. *Whether the introduction and operationalisation of “caste-based discrimination” under the Impugned Regulations would have any bearing on the existing constitutional and statutory sub-classification of the Most Backward Castes within the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Other Backward Classes, and whether the Impugned Regulations provide adequate and effective protection and safeguards to such Extremely Backward Castes against discrimination and structural disadvantage?*
3. *Whether the inclusion of the expression “segregation” in Clause 7(d) of the Impugned Regulations, in the context of allocation of hostels, classrooms, mentorship groups, or similar academic or residential arrangements, albeit on transparent and non-discriminatory criteria, would amount to a “separate yet equal” classification, thereby infringing the constitutional guarantees of equality and fraternity under Articles 14, 15 as well as the Preamble to the Constitution of India?*
4. *Whether the omission of the term “Ragging” as a specific form of discrimination in the framework of the Impugned Regulations, despite its existence in the University Grants Commission (Promotion of Equity in Higher Education Institutions) Regulations, 2012, constitutes a regressive and exclusionary legislative omission? If so, whether such omission is violative of unequal treatment of victims of discrimination by creating an asymmetry in access to justice and thus falls foul of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India?*
5. *Any other ancillary question that may arise or be proposed by the parties during the course of these proceedings and warrant the intervention of this Court.”*

The Court observed that the issues raised in W.P.(C) No. 1149/2019 would have a bearing on the examination of the validity of the 2026 UGC Regulations, and therefore the matters required to be heard together by a larger Bench. The Court issued the following directions—

1. All connected writ petitions were directed to be listed before a three-Judge

Bench.

2. The 2026 UGC Regulations were directed to be “kept in abeyance.”
3. In exercise of powers under Article 142 of the Constitution, the Court directed that the University Grants Commission (Promotion of Equity in Higher Education Institutions) Regulations, 2012 “will continue to operate and remain in force till further orders.”

Advocates who appeared in this case:

Mr. Satyam Pandey, AOR, Mr. Neeraj Kumar Singh, Adv., Mr. Kisalaya Shukla, Adv., Mr. Sandeep Kumar Dwivedi, Adv., Mr. Makardhvaj Yadav, Adv., Mr. Vishweshwar Mishra, Adv., Mr. Raghvendra Upadhyay, Adv., Ms. Purnima Jain, Adv., Mr. Awadhesh Kumar, Adv., Mr. Umesh Pal, Adv., Mr. Deelip Kumar, Adv., Ms. Rashika Khanna, Adv., Mr. Pradeep Kumar Dwivedi, Adv., Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Adv., Mr. Raj Kishor Choudhary, AOR, Mr. Shakeel Ahmed, Adv., Mr. Vikram Patralekh, Adv., Mr. Syed Faizan Ali, Adv., Ms. Shalini Tripathi, Adv., Mr. Hari Shankar Jain, Adv., Mr. Vishnu Shankar Jain, Adv., Mr. Parth Yadav, AOR, Ms. Mani Munjal, Adv., Ms. Marbiang Khongwir, Adv., Mr. Shaurya Krishna, Adv., Mr. Saurabh Singh, Adv., Ms. Indira Jaising, Sr. Adv., Mr. Prasanna S., AOR, Ms. Disha Wadekar, Adv., Mr. Paras Nath Singh, Adv., Ms. Injila Muslim Zaidi, Adv., Mr. Ashish Reddy, Adv., Ms. Apoorva Singh, Adv., Mr. Ashutosh Dubey, Adv., Ms. Rajshri Dubey, Adv., Mr. Abhishek Chauhan, Adv., Mr. Amit P. Shahi, Adv., Ms. Ishita, Adv., Mr. Tushar Mehta, Solicitor General, Mr. Manoj Ranjan Sinha, Adv., Mr. Vishal Agrawal, Adv., Mr. Bhuwan, Adv., Dr. Vinod Kumar Tewari, AOR, Mr. Bhoopesh Pandey, Adv., Mr. S.K. Warish Ali, Adv., For Parties

ORDER

1. Issue notice, returnable on 19.03.2026.
2. On the asking of Court, Mr. Tushar Mehta, learned Solicitor General of India, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 and 2.
3. We have heard learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner(s), learned Solicitor General of India, as well as Ms. Indira Jaising, learned Senior Advocate, and have perused the University Grants Commission (Promotion of Equity in Higher Education Institutions) Regulations, 2026 (hereinafter “2026 UGC Regulations”/“Impugned Regulations”).
4. The Petitioner(s) have primarily contended that the incorporation of Clause 3(c) in the 2026 UGC Regulations defining “Caste-based Discrimination” is restrictive and exclusionary in its formulation, as the individuals belonging to non-reserved or general classes are rendered completely remediless under the statutory framework, even if they are subjected to caste-based discrimination or institutional bias within higher education institutions. It is their case that the Impugned Regulations proceed on an unfounded presumption that caste-based

discrimination is necessarily unidirectional and can never operate against persons belonging to non-reserved or general categories.

5. Upon a *prima facie* consideration, it appears to us that some of the provisions of the Impugned Regulations suffer from certain ambiguities, and the possibility of their misuse cannot be ruled out. We are of the *prima facie* view that the following substantial questions of law arise for consideration and would require detailed examination:

- (i) Whether the incorporation of Clause 3(c) in the Impugned Regulations, defining “Caste-based Discrimination”, bears a reasonable and rational nexus to subserve the object and purpose of the 2026 UGC Regulations, particularly in light of the fact that no distinct or special procedural mechanism has been prescribed to address caste-based discrimination, as opposed to the exhaustive and inclusive definition of “Discrimination” provided under Clause 3(e) of the Impugned Regulations?
- (ii) Whether the introduction and operationalisation of “caste-based discrimination” under the Impugned Regulations would have any bearing on the existing constitutional and statutory sub-classification of the Most Backward Castes within the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Other Backward Classes, and whether the Impugned Regulations provide adequate and effective protection and safeguards to such Extremely Backward Castes against discrimination and structural disadvantage?
- (iii) Whether the inclusion of the expression “segregation” in Clause 7(d) of the Impugned Regulations, in the context of allocation of hostels, classrooms, mentorship groups, or similar academic or residential arrangements, *albeit* on transparent and non-discriminatory criteria, would amount to a “separate yet equal” classification, thereby infringing the constitutional guarantees of equality and fraternity under Articles 14, 15 as well as the Preamble to the Constitution of India?
- (iv) Whether the omission of the term “Ragging” as a specific form of discrimination in the framework of the Impugned Regulations, despite its existence in the University Grants Commission (Promotion of Equity in Higher Education Institutions) Regulations, 2012, constitutes a regressive and exclusionary legislative omission? If so, whether such omission is violative of unequal treatment of victims of discrimination by creating an asymmetry in access to justice and thus falls foul of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India??
- (v) Any other ancillary question that may arise or be proposed by the parties during the course of these proceedings and warrant the intervention of this Court.

6. During the course of hearing, it has been pointed out that the

issues raised in W.P. (Civil) No. 1149/2019 shall also have bearing while examining the constitutionality/validity of the Impugned Regulations. Accordingly, these writ petitions are ordered to be heard along with the above-mentioned writ petition. All the matters are directed to be listed before a three-Judge bench on the date fixed.

7. Meanwhile, the University Grants Commission (Promotion of Equity in Higher Education Institutions) Regulations, 2026, are directed to be kept in abeyance.

8. In exercise of our powers under Article 142 of the Constitution, we further direct that the University Grants Commission (Promotion of Equity in Higher Education Institutions) Regulations, 2012, will continue to operate and remain in force till further orders.

Disclaimer: While every effort is made to avoid any mistake or omission, this casenote/ headnote/ judgment/ act/ rule/ regulation/ circular/ notification is being circulated on the condition and understanding that the publisher would not be liable in any manner by reason of any mistake or omission or for any action taken or omitted to be taken or advice rendered or accepted on the basis of this casenote/ headnote/ judgment/ act/ rule/ regulation/ circular/ notification. All disputes will be subject exclusively to jurisdiction of courts, tribunals and forums at Lucknow only. The authenticity of this text must be verified from the original source.