



\$~139

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010402582026
+ **W.P.(C) 12474/2026& CM APPL. 57883/2026, CM APPL. 57884/2026, CM APPL. 57885/2026**
ASTHA SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mayank Sapra, Ms. Lalima Das,
Mr. Abhi Sharma, Ms. Karuvaki
Mohanty, Mr. Arjun Chopra, Mr.
Devvrat Singh, Advs.

versus

UOI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy,
CGSC with Mr. Deepansh Sharma,
GP with Ms. Usha Jamnal, Ms. Nyasa
Sharma, Mr. Siddhant Nagar, Mr.
Abhinav Mall, Advs. for UOI

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER
25.08.2026

%

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:-

“a) Issue a Writ in the nature of Mandamus, or any other appropriate Writ, Order, or Direction to set-aside the Eligibility Certificate dated 06.08.2026 issued by Respondent



No. 4 and the Eligibility Certificate dated 14.08.2026 issued by Respondent No. 5 for being erroneous, non-speaking, arbitrary, and illegal;

b) Issue a Writ in the nature of Mandamus, or any other appropriate Writ, Order, or Direction to declare the Petitioner as eligible for admission to the MBBS Course under the PwBD category in NEET-UG 2026;..”

2. For the reasons stated in the petition, issue notice.
3. Ms. Rudy, learned CGSC, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1, 3, 6 and 7. Nobody is present on behalf of the other respondents.
4. The brief facts of the present case are that the petitioner is a meritorious candidate and also has a benchmark disability, holding a valid subsisting UDID Card dated 20.10.2025 recording 60% permanent hearing impairment. The petitioner appeared in NEET-UG 2026, scored 298 marks, and secured a rank of 1377 under her category.
5. The respondent No. 4, *i.e.*, the Medical Assessment Board of BHU, assessed the disability of the petitioner at 12% and recorded that there is no risk to the patient safety.
6. Subsequently, on appeal, respondent No. 5, *i.e.*, the Appellate Board VMCC & Safdarjung Hospital, on 14.08.2026, recorded the disability of the petitioner at 85.6%, higher than the petitioner's UDID card and declared her wholly ineligible for pursuing medical education.
7. Hence, the present petition has been filed.
8. Mr. Sapra, learned counsel for the petitioner, argues that there cannot be such variance between the UDID Card, the medical assessment of respondent No. 4 and the medical assessment of respondent No. 5. He



further states that as per the guidelines issued by the respondent No. 2, the details contained in the UDID card are to take primacy.

9. Mr. Rudy, learned CGSC, disputes the same and states that there are other parameters, which the respondents are bound to take into consideration while deciding the eligibility of the petitioner. The same is relevant because the petitioner is seeking a degree in medicine, which deals with the health care of people.
10. However, it is agreeable to the parties that the petitioner may submit herself to a fresh assessment before the respondent No. 5/Appellate Board.
11. The petitioner shall submit herself for assessment on 31.08.2026 at 11:30 a.m. at the respondent No. 5 office. She shall also carry the concerned assistive device, on which she is relying. The Respondent No. 5/Appellate Board shall conduct the assessment as per the extant rules, regulations, policies and law and shall issue a report which shall be in the form of a speaking order.
12. The report, as indicated above, shall be handed over to the petitioner. In case she is found eligible, she shall be granted admission and in case the report is against the petitioner, she shall be entitled to challenge the same in accordance with law.
13. The petition is disposed of with the aforesaid directions.

JASMEET SINGH, J

AUGUST 25, 2026/sp