



India.

8. In the present case, petitioner has relied upon the fact that grant-in-aid was sanctioned in the year 2014 and that a sum of Rs. 2,00,000/- was released in the year 2019 after conversion to token grant-in-aid. However, such past financial assistance does not confer any vested or continuing right upon petitioner to claim grant-in-aid as a matter of course. The grant of financial aid is essentially a matter of policy, dependent upon availability of resources and priorities of the State. The contention regarding arbitrariness and violation of Article 14 of the Constitution of India also does not merit acceptance. The petitioner has not placed any material on record to demonstrate that similarly situated institutions are being granted such aid while the petitioner has been singled out for denial. In absence of any such material, the plea of discrimination remains unsubstantiated. So far as the grievance regarding non-extension of benefits of welfare schemes is concerned, no specific statutory provision or scheme has been brought on record to show that the petitioner or its students are entitled to such benefits as a matter of right, irrespective of the status of the institution. Thus, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case for interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is made out."

2. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant has been unable to show to us that how the findings recorded by the learned Single Judge are in any manner illegal or suffer from any infirmity. Consequently, we find no good ground to interfere with the same. The appeal is, accordingly, dismissed.

(MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA, C. J.)

(SUBHASH UPADHYAY, J.)

Dated: 07.07.2026

Rajni