



\$~J

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Judgment reserved on: 11.08.2026

Judgment pronounced on: 25.08.2026

+ **W.P. (C) 8114/2026**

AARAV DHAWAN MINOR THROUGH HIS FATHER AND

NATURAL GUARDIAN

....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rishi Manchanda and Mr.
Siddharth Mullick, Advs.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

....Respondents

Through: Mr. Arjun Mitra, Sr. Adv. with Ms.
Jayanti Jha Adv. for respondent No. 4
Mr. Mohit Agarwal and Mr. Prerak
Khurana, Advs. for respondent Nos. 1
and 2
Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat SC NSUT with
Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms. Aliza
Alam, Mr Mohnish Sehrawat, Advs. for
respondent No. 3

+ **CONT. CAS (C) 1212/2026**

AARAV DHAWAN MINOR THROUGH HIS FATHER AND

NATURAL GUARDIAN

....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rishi Manchanda and Mr.



Siddharth Mullick, Advs.

versus

TARUN RAWAT CHAIRMAN JOINT ADMISSION
COUNSELLING

....Respondents

Through: Mr. Arjun Mitra, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Jayanti Jha Adv. for respondent No. 4
Mr. Mohit Agarwal and Mr. Prerak Khurana, Advs. for respondent Nos. 1 and 2
Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat SC NSUT with Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms. Aliza Alam, Mr Mohnish Sehrawat, Advs. for respondent No. 3

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

J U D G M E N T

W.P. (C) 8114/2026

1. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking to direct the respondents to allow the petitioner to register and participate in the counselling program of the Joint Admission Committee ("**JAC**") Counselling Programme i.e., the respondent No. 3 in order to enable the petitioner to take admission in one of the universities for the undergraduate programme in engineering.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

2. The petitioner herein is a student who has completed his entire education in India since the beginning and has cleared his Class XII examinations



from Central Board of Secondary Education, Delhi in the year 2026. Since the petitioner is a minor, the present petition is being filed by the father, who is the natural guardian of the petitioner.

3. The petitioner appeared in the Joint Entrance Examinations, 2026 (**“JEE”**) under the Overseas Citizen of India (**“OCI”**)/Person of Indian Origin (**“POI”**) category, the card for which was issued on 31.10.2019, as the petitioner was born in Houston, U.S.A. The petitioner scored 99.21 percentile in the said examination and secured an All India rank of 12,617.
4. The petitioner registered through online registration process which commenced on 28.05.2026 and closed on 09.06.2026. While completing the formalities for online registration process, the petitioner was unable to register for the process as the petitioner was an OCI card holder and counselling programme of the JAC did not allow OCI card holder to participate for the counselling of universities under JAC.
5. The petitioner immediately contacted the grievance committee of the JAC and requested to let him participate in the JAC Counselling. However, no action was taken on the representation of the petitioner and the petitioner was continued to be disallowed from the said Counselling. Hence, the present petition.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

6. Mr. Rishi Manchanda, learned counsel for the petitioner, states that the petitioner has completed his entire education in India and has graduated from Class XII from the Central Board of Secondary Education (**“CBSE”**), Delhi, in the year 2026. Since the petitioner was born in



Houston, USA, the petitioner appeared in the JEE exam under the OCI/PIO category.

7. He states that the notification issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs dated 04.03.2021 which sought to restrict OCI card holders from being allotted seats reserved for Indian Nationals and being treated at par with them, is prospective and does not affect pre 04.03.2021 OCI cardholders. While placing heavy reliance on **Anushka Rengunthwar & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.**¹, wherein students holding OCI cards, issued prior to 04.03.2021 have been held to be at par with Indian Nationals, he states that the ratio of the said judgment squarely applies to the petitioner and the petitioner falls within the category created by **Anushka Rengunthwar (Supra)**.
8. He points out that the guidelines devised in the said case, being pre-04.03.2021 OCI Cardholders to be treated at par with the Indian Nationals and be referred to as OCI (I), have been adopted by Joint Seat Allocation Authority, Ministry of Education; JAC Chandigarh and JEE (Advance). Despite, the said judgment being categorically pointed out by the petitioner in his representation dated 01.06.2026 to the respondent No. 3, the respondent No. 3 did not consider the same.
9. He negates that Direct Admission of Students Abroad (**"DASA"**) Counselling is an alternative remedy available to the petitioner as the DASA Information Brochure, 2026 at Section III discloses the residential requirement for OCI Cardholder to atleast have studied 2 years out of past 8 years, inclusive of Class XI/XII, in a foreign country. The petitioner has throughout completed his schooling from India and thus does not fulfil

¹ (2023) 11 SCC 209.



the eligibility conditions of DASA Counselling.

10. It is stated by the learned counsel that this has created an anomaly as now the petitioner is ineligible for DASA Counselling as well as JAC Counselling. He points out that the closing rank for Delhi Technical University ("**DTU**") (Computer Science Engineering) (institution desired by the petitioner through JAC Counselling) after Round II of counselling was 12,771; Round III was 12,966 and Round IV was 14,806. The petitioner's rank is numerically lower, thus, making him a more suitable candidate than all those who have been allotted seats.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT NO. 3

11. Ms. Aliza Alam, learned counsel for the respondent No. 3, states that the eligibility criteria which governs the admission through JAC Delhi were published well in advance in the Admission Brochure and were available in the public domain prior to the commencement of the admission process. The candidates were required to determine their eligibility and participate in the admission process. The eligibility criteria is strictly as per the Admission Brochure and any relaxation for any candidate would have far reaching consequences as it would impact the legitimate expectation of other candidates adversely.
12. She distinguishes the admission framework applicable to the Resident Indian Nationals and that applicable to the OCI/PIO/NRI. She states that the admission for RINs is in accordance with the JAC Delhi Admission Brochure which provides 85% seats belonging to students in Delhi and 15% to outside Delhi, whereas on the other hand the OCI/PIO/NRI are governed by DASA rules formulated by the Ministry of Education and JAC does not make any provision for OCI students. If the petitioner, who



is eligible under DASA, is allowed to apply through JAC, it would be contrary to eligibility framework and would result in differential treatment of other OCI/PIO candidates. Since there already exists a different mechanism it cannot be said that OCI candidates are being excluded.

13. It is also stated by her that the reliance on the judgment namely, **Anushka Rengunthwar (Supra)** by the learned counsel for the petitioner is misplaced as above case arose in the context of medical admissions through the NEET-UG framework, where admissions to MBBS programmes are given through a common national admission mechanism. In contrast, the candidates seeking admissions in engineering processes have various mechanisms including admissions through various National Institutes of Technology, Indian Institutes of Information Technology, Centrally Funded Technical Institutions and State Universities, Netaji Subhas University of Technology and Delhi Technological University have identified 19 and 8 seats respectively in Computer Science and Engineering under DASA.
14. She refers to DASA Brochure of the Year 2026-2027 which was released on 27.05.2026 and allowed the OCI (I) Candidates to participate in the counselling process. Thereafter, the requirement for DASA was modified mid-way and the OCI (I) candidates who did not have atleast 2 years of education out of past 8 years, inclusive of class XI/ XII, in a foreign country, were barred from participating in DASA Counselling.
15. It is also pointed out that the Eligibility Conditions of the Brochure provide that 85% of the seats in all the participating institutions were reserved for Indian Nationals based in Delhi Region and the rest 15% for



the Indian Nationals based outside Delhi (***“85:15 seat matrix”***). The petitioner being an OCI card holder is not eligible for participation in counselling of JAC Delhi 2026 and thus was unable to register himself.

16. She states that in the second round (03.07.2026) of counselling the cut off for computer science in DTU was 12,771 and in the third round of counselling (09.07.2026) the cut off was 12,966. The petitioner being the OCI card holder was ineligible for the JAC counselling and since the petitioner has not challenged the brochure, the relief as prayed for cannot be given to the petitioner.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT NO. 4

17. Mr. Arjun Mitra, learned senior counsel for the respondent No. 4, states that the petitioner is ineligible for DASA counselling. The eligibility conditions of the DASA counselling require the candidate to pursue his education from outside of India at least for 2 years out of the past 8 years, inclusive of class XI and XII. The petitioner does not meet the said criteria.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

18. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record.
19. Before delving into the facts of the case it is pertinent to discuss the ratio laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Anushka Rengunthwar (Supra)***. The relevant paragraphs read as under:

“54. As noted, the right of the OCI Cardholders is a mid-way right in the absence of dual citizenship. When a statutory right was conferred and such right is being withdrawn through a notification, the process for



withdrawal is required to demonstrate that the action taken is reasonable and has nexus to the purpose. It should not be arbitrary, without basis and exercise of such power cannot be exercised unmindful of consequences merely because it is a sovereign power. To examine this aspect, in addition to the contentions urged by the learned Additional Solicitor General we have also taken note of the objection statement filed with the writ petition.

55. Though detailed contentions are urged with regard to the status of a citizen and the sovereign power of the State, as already noted, in these petitions the sovereign power has not been questioned but the manner in which it is exercised in the present circumstance is objected. The contention of learned Additional Solicitor General is that the intention from the beginning was to grant parity to OCI Cardholders only with NRIs. On that aspect as already noted above we have seen the nature of the benefit that had been extended to the petitioners and the similarly placed petitioners under the notifications of the year 2005, 2007 and 2009. The further contention insofar as equating the OCI Cardholders to compete only for the seats which are reserved for NRIs and to exclude the OCI Cardholders for admission against any seat reserved exclusively for the Indian citizens, across the board, even to the persons who were bestowed the right earlier, it is stated that the rationale is to protect the rights of the Indian citizens in such matters where State may give



preference to its citizens vis-à-vis foreigners holding OCI Cards. It is further averred in the counter that number of seats available for medical and engineering courses in India are very limited and that it does not fully cater to the requirement of even the Indian citizens. It is therefore contended that the right to admission to such seats should primarily be available to the Indian citizens instead of foreigners, including OCI Cardholders.

xxx

67. Therefore in the factual background of the issue involved, to sum up, it will have to be held that though the impugned notification dated 04.03.2021 is based on a policy and in the exercise of the statutory power of a Sovereign State, the provisions as contained therein shall apply prospectively only to persons who are born in a foreign country subsequent to 04.03.2021 i.e. the date of the notification and who seek for a registration as OCI cardholder from that date since at that juncture the parents would have a choice to either seek for citizenship by descent or to continue as a foreigner in the background of the subsisting policy of the Sovereign State.

xxx

70. We further hold that the petitioners in all these cases and all other similarly placed OCI cardholders will be entitled to the rights and privileges which had been conferred on them earlier to the notification dated



04.03.2021 and could be availed by them notwithstanding the exclusion carved out in the notification dated 04.03.2021. The participation of the petitioners and similarly placed OCI cardholders in the selection process and the subsequent action based on the interim orders passed herein or elsewhere shall stand regularised.”

20. The Hon’ble Supreme Court has categorically held that the OCI card holders, who had secured the same prior to 04.03.2021, are entitled to the rights and benefits, which were conferred to them prior to notification dated 04.03.2021, i.e. is they are to be treated at par with the Indian Nationals.
21. At this juncture, it would be apposite to advert to the said notification dated 04.03.2021 issued by Ministry of Home Affairs. The said notification makes a specific reference to OCI Card holders appearing in National Eligibility cum Entrance Test, JEE (Mains), JEE (Advanced) or such other tests. The said notification reads as under:

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

NOTIFICATION

New Delhi, the 4th March, 2021

S.O. 1050(E) – *In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7B of the Citizenship Act, 1955 (57 of 1955) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs published in the Official Gazette vide number S.O. 542(E), dated the 11th April, 2005 and the notifications of the Government of India in the erstwhile Ministry of Overseas*



Indian Affairs published in the Official Gazette vide numbers S.O. 12(E), dated the 5th January, 2007 and S.O. 36(E), dated the 5th January, 2009, except as respect things done or omitted to be done before such supersession, the Central Government hereby specifies the following rights to which an Overseas Citizen of India Cardholder (hereinafter referred to as the OCI cardholder) shall be entitled, with effect from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, namely:

...

(4) parity with Non-Resident Indians in the Matter of,-

(i) inter-country adoption of Indian children subject to the compliance of the procedure as laid down by the competent authority for such adoption;

(ii) appearing for the all India entrance tests such as National Eligibility cum Entrance Test, Joint Entrance Examination (Mains), Joint Entrance Examination (Advanced) or such other tests to make them eligible for admission only against any Non-Resident Indian seat or any supernumerary seat; Provided that the OCI cardholder shall not be eligible for admission against any seat reserved exclusively for Indian citizens.

(5) in respect of all other economic, financial and educational fields not specified in this notification or the rights and privileges not covered by the notifications made by the Reserve Bank of India under the Foreign Exchange



Management Act, 1999 (42 of 1999), the OCI cardholder shall have the same rights and privileges as a foreigner.....”

(emphasis supplied)

22. The aforesaid notification undoubtedly has brought material change in the rights of the OCI card holders by restricting their eligibility for admission to NRI or supernumerary seats. However, the use of expression “such other test” assumes relevance and signifies that the notification is not just confined to NEET, JEE Mains or JEE Advance, rather any “such other test” is wide enough to encompass any other counselling process of a similar nature such as JAC counselling. JAC cannot be viewed differently merely because it is not specifically named in the aforesaid notification. The judgment of ***Anushka Rengunthwar (Supra)*** has accorded protection to the OCI card holders prior to issuance of the notification. At the same time the OCI card holders acquiring such status after the issuance of notification would be governed by the policy as laid down in that notification. In the view of the above discussion, the expression “other such test” brings JAC in the ambit of the notification and the judgment of ***Anushka Rengunthwar (Supra)*** makes the notification applicable only to the candidates only prospectively i.e only to candidates who were conferred the OCI status after 04.03.2021.
23. JAC was introduced in the year 2014 for admission to Undergraduate Programmes in Engineering and Architecture in Delhi Government funded Universities with the objective of providing a common counselling platform and avoiding multiple admission counselling processes. Even though JAC may operate as a counselling mechanism on the basis of marks of a different examination, i.e. JEE (Mains), rather



than an independent examination itself, such a distinction cannot be used to eliminate the candidates holding OCI card, who secured the same prior to 2021.

24. There is no intelligible differentia discernible for excluding OCI card holders from the benefit of JAC while extending the same to similarly situated candidates in other admissions and counselling processes. Once the OCI card holders have been held entitled to certain rights under the scheme as existed prior to notification of 2021, a distinction cannot be merely drawn on the basis of a particular counselling mechanism. This distinction of different counselling process, as alleged by the respondent No. 3, has no rational nexus with the objective of regulating admissions to the participating institutions.
25. Further, the respondent No. 3 has contended that the petitioner cannot be granted any relief as the petitioner has failed to challenge the brochure of JAC counselling. I am unable to agree with the same. The petitioner in the present case does not seek alteration of the academic criteria prescribed under the brochure; rather the petitioner seeks to apply the ratio laid down in **Anushka Rengunthwar (Supra)**. Once the Hon'ble Supreme Court has declared that the OCI card holders (prior to 04.03.2021) are entitled to rights similar to that of Indian Nationals, the observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court are binding upon the respondents as well as this Court.
26. Further the respondent No. 3 also seeks to argue that permitting the petitioner to participate in JAC counselling would adversely affect the legitimate expectation of the candidates. Such argument cannot be accepted. Legitimate expectation arises from consistent past practice and



should not be illogical or unreasonable.² Thus, legitimate expectations of other candidates cannot be contrary to the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. It was rather shortcoming on the part of the respondent No. 3 who failed to implement the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its true letter, spirit and intent. The inclusion of the petitioner does not confer any right upon the petitioner which previously did not exist, rather, this Court is only attempting to reinforce the right available to the petitioner.

27. The alternative suggested by the respondent No. 3, namely admission through DASA counselling process is of no assistance to the petitioner. The petitioner is not eligible to participate in the DASA counselling as the petitioner does not satisfy the requirement of having studied in a foreign country for 2 years in the past 8 years, inclusive of Class XI/XII. The same stands substantiated by the stand of Mr. Mitra, learned senior counsel. Therefore, relegating the petitioner to DASA counselling would in effect leave the petitioner without any meaningful alternative remedy. This rather seems to be an attempt on part of the respondent No. 3 to dodge the issue.
28. This brings to the fore rather an anomalous situation that on one hand the petitioner is ineligible for DASA counselling and on the other hand the petitioner is also excluded from JAC counselling on the ground of being a candidate under OCI category and not being a Resident Indian National. I find no reason why the petitioner should not have been permitted to participate in counselling for JAC and classification of 85:15 seat matrix rule of the counselling could not have been applied to the petitioner, who

² *Army Welfare Education Society v. Sunil Kumar Sharma*, (2024) 16 SCC 598. Refer paragraph No. 63



is an OCI card holder (securing the same prior to 04.03.2021). The petitioner is not claiming a special OCI quota or seeking for alteration of 85:15 seat matrix for JAC counselling and is also not challenging any terms of the brochure. His only case is that he may be treated at par with the Indian National. Once in the light of the judgment of **Anushka Rengunthwar (Supra)**, status has already been conferred upon the petitioner, the petitioner cannot be discriminated or relegated under JAC counselling.

29. My attention has been drawn to JAC Chandigarh brochure which divides the OCI candidates into three categories. The brochure reads as under:

(i). Those OCI/PIO candidates who have obtained their OCI/PIO cards subsequent to 04.03.2021 are considered as foreign national candidates and are governed by the eligibility conditions contained herein for the foreign national candidates. For ease of convenience, these candidates are NOT eligible for seat allotment in JAC Chandigarh system.

(ii). Those OCI/PIO candidates who have obtained their OCI/PIO cards before 04.03.2021 AND choose to be considered as foreign nationals, are governed by the eligibility conditions contained herein for the foreign national candidates and are also referred to as OCI/PIO(F) The OCI/PIO(F) candidates will NOT be eligible for seat allocation in JAC Chandigarh system.

(iii). Those OCI/PIO candidates who have obtained their OCI/PIO cards before 04.03.2021 AND choose to be treated



as par with Indian nationals, are governed by eligibility conditions contained herein for the Indian national candidates and are referred to as OCI/PIO (I).

30. JAC Chandigarh has incorporated the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and has created two categories, i.e. one prior to 04.03.2021 and one subsequent to 04.03.2021. The candidates falling in the category prior to 04.03.2021 are further given an option to opt whether they want to be considered OCI (I) or OCI (F) category.
31. On the contrary, JAC Delhi has neither incorporated the OCI card holder in the counselling process nor has chosen to extend the benefit of **Anushka Rengunthwar (Supra)** to pre-04.03.2021 OCI category candidates. The consequence of the same is that the petitioner, despite having obtained his OCI Card prior to 04.03.2021, having completed his entire education in India and having secured the requisite merit is rendered ineligible under both admission mechanisms. He is, thus, left without any mechanism to seek admission to the participating institutions under JAC counselling. Such a consequence would defeat, rather than give effect to, the protection given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court to similarly situated pre-04.03.2021 OCI card holders.
32. I cannot lose sight of the fact despite having the rank of 12,617, the petitioner has not considered for JAC counselling and candidates having ranked lower than him, in merit, have been granted a seat in the same institution as desired by the petitioner. The same cannot be so done.
33. This court *vide* Order dated 10.07.2026 permitted the petitioner to participate in counselling but in grave violation of the order of this Court, the petitioner was not allowed to do the same.



34. In view of the above discussion, the petition is allowed and the writ of mandamus is issued directing the respondent No. 3 to allot the seat to the petitioner in the institution corresponding to the rank of the petitioner treating the petitioner as a Resident Indian National, within 2 weeks from today.
35. Since the petitioner is a meritorious student and has approached the Court in time, the academic career of the petitioner shall not be permitted to be interdicted for the lapse on part of the respondent No. 3 to implement the orders of this Court. The case of the petitioner is a rare one wherein the petitioner was denied the benefit of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court and has been denied the opportunity of being treated fairly. Thus, in case the need arises, a supernumerary seat maybe created in the favour of the petitioner in terms dicta laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***S. Krishna Sradha v. State of A.P., (2020) 17 SCC 465*** wherein the relevant paragraph read as under:

“13. In light of the discussion/observations made hereinabove, a meritorious candidate/student who has been denied an admission in MBBS course illegally or irrationally by the authorities for no fault of his/her and who has approached the Court in time and so as to see that such a meritorious candidate may not have to suffer for no fault of his/her, we answer the reference as under:

13.1. That in a case where candidate/student has approached the court at the earliest and without any delay and that the question is with respect to the admission in medical course all the efforts shall be made by the court



concerned to dispose of the proceedings by giving priority and at the earliest.

13.2. Under exceptional circumstances, if the court finds that there is no fault attributable to the candidate and the candidate has pursued his/her legal right expeditiously without any delay and there is fault only on the part of the authorities and/or there is apparent breach of rules and regulations as well as related principles in the process of grant of admission which would violate the right of equality and equal treatment to the competing candidates and if the time schedule prescribed — 30th September, is over, to do the complete justice, the Court under exceptional circumstances and in rarest of rare cases direct the admission in the same year by directing to increase the seats, however, it should not be more than one or two seats and such admissions can be ordered within reasonable time i.e. within one month from 30th September i.e. cut-off date and under no circumstances, the Court shall order any admission in the same year beyond 30th October. However, it is observed that such relief can be granted only in exceptional circumstances and in the rarest of rare cases. In case of such an eventuality, the Court may also pass an order cancelling the admission given to a candidate who is at the bottom of the merit list of the category who, if the admission would have been given to a more meritorious candidate who has been denied admission illegally, would



not have got the admission, if the Court deems it fit and proper, however, after giving an opportunity of hearing to a student whose admission is sought to be cancelled.

13.3. In case the Court is of the opinion that no relief of admission can be granted to such a candidate in the very academic year and wherever it finds that the action of the authorities has been arbitrary and in breach of the rules and regulations or the prospectus affecting the rights of the students and that a candidate is found to be meritorious and such candidate/student has approached the court at the earliest and without any delay, the court can mould the relief and direct the admission to be granted to such a candidate in the next academic year by issuing appropriate directions by directing to increase in the number of seats as may be considered appropriate in the case and in case of such an eventuality and if it is found that the management was at fault and wrongly denied the admission to the meritorious candidate, in that case, the Court may direct to reduce the number of seats in the management quota of that year, meaning thereby the student/students who was/were denied admission illegally to be accommodated in the next academic year out of the seats allotted in the management quota.

13.4. Grant of the compensation could be an additional remedy but not a substitute for restitutorial remedies. Therefore, in an appropriate case the Court may award the



compensation to such a meritorious candidate who for no fault of his/her has to lose one full academic year and who could not be granted any relief of admission in the same academic year.

13.5. It is clarified that the aforesaid directions pertain to admission in MBBS course only and we have not dealt with postgraduate medical course.

36. The writ petition is disposed of in aforesaid terms, with pending applications, if any.

CONT. CAS (C) 1212/2026

37. This is a contempt petition filed under Section 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India or violation of the order dated 10.07.2026.
38. This Court *vide* order dated 10.07.2026 had specifically directed the respondents to permit the petitioner to participate in the JAC Counselling and allot a seat corresponding to the rank of the petitioner. Despite the said direction, even after three rounds of JAC counselling the petitioner has not been allowed to participate in the counselling and admittedly, the candidates having higher rank (numerically) and therefore lower in merit list have secured admission in the institute and course desired by the petitioner. The petitioner despite having a better position in the merit list has not been offered the said course and has been placed at a disadvantageous position.
39. The order of this court is required to be complied with in true letter, spirit and intent. Compliance cannot be reduced to a mere formality. Merely permitting the petitioner to register for the JAC Counselling without



considering his candidature for the Counselling has not only rendered the direction of this court illusory but has also caused grave prejudice to the petitioner.

40. In view of the directions issued in W.P. (C) 8114/2026, and the fact that the respondent No. 3 is granted 2 weeks to comply with the directions, the contempt petition is disposed of, granting the petitioner the liberty to revive the petition in case the order is not complied with.

JASMEET SINGH, J.

AUGUST 25, 2026/(MU)