



\$~87

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

# **CNR No. DLHC010402952026**

+ **W.P.(C) 12506/2026**

**VALSALA KURIAKOSE**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhik Chimni, Ms. Pranjal Abrol, Mr. Gurupal, Singh, Ms. Moksha Sharma and Mr. Ayan Dasgupta, Advocates.

versus

**I P COLLEGE FOR WOMEN & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra and Ms. Tripta Sharma, Advocates for University of Delhi.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

**ORDER**

%

**25.08.2026**

1. The Petitioner is a retired Associate Professor of Indraprastha College for Women, University of Delhi. During her service, she was allotted a staff quarter under a Licence Agreement dated 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2013, on a licence fee of INR 18,000/- per month. Her House Rent Allowance [*"HRA"*] was simultaneously withdrawn with effect from November 2013.

2. In January 2014, the Petitioner and other resident teachers filed writ petition titled as ***Rekha Sethi & Ors. v. I.P. College for Women & Ors.***<sup>1</sup> before this Court, questioning, *inter alia*, the quantum of licence fee charged

---

<sup>1</sup> W.P.(C) No. 124/2014, order dated 24<sup>th</sup> January, 2014.



by Trust/Society-managed colleges. Recovery of licence fee stood suspended from January 2014, while the matter remained *sub judice*.

3. Meanwhile, by judgment dated 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2016 in ***Jagdish Parsad & Ors. v. University of Delhi & Ors.***<sup>2</sup>, the Division Bench of this Court held that the allottees of staff quarters were not entitled to HRA. The Division Bench further directed the UGC to appoint a Committee, in consultation with the University of Delhi, to examine the question of recovery of arrears in each case, keeping in view the applicable parameters and the ratio in ***State of Punjab v. Rafiq Masih***<sup>3</sup>. As regards licence fee, the Division Bench left open the contention that the licence fee being charged was higher than the standard rent applicable to Central Government employees, permitting the same to be raised before the Committee along with supporting evidence.

4. In terms of the aforesaid judgment, ***Rekha Sethi*** [W.P.(C) No. 124/2014] was dismissed on 16<sup>th</sup> March, 2017. As regards licence fee, the Single Bench held that the issue of the quantum of licence fee was also to be decided while examining the question of recovery of arrears by the Committee constituted pursuant to the directions of the Division Bench.

5. The College thereafter sought recovery of outstanding licence fee dues in September 2017, whereupon the resident teachers, including the Petitioner, approached the Supreme Court. In October 2017, the Supreme Court stayed the recovery of the arrears.

6. At the time of her retirement in March 2019, the College raised a demand of INR 11,72,874/- against the Petitioner, comprising INR 11,34,000/- towards licence fee for 63 months, from January 2014 to March

---

<sup>2</sup> LPA No. 374/2015, and other connected matter.

<sup>3</sup> (2015) 4 SCC 334.



2019, and INR 38,874/- towards HRA for September and October 2013. To secure release of her retiral dues, the Petitioner was constrained to pledge fixed deposits of INR 12,00,000/-, which remain in the custody of Canara Bank, I.P. College branch, pending adjudication of the present petition.

7. By order dated 18<sup>th</sup> December, 2024 in ***Papori Kanwar & Ors. v. I.P. College for Women & Ors.***<sup>4</sup> and connected matters, including the Petitioner's SLP, the Supreme Court noted that the Committee had already been constituted and directed that the Committee must now resolve the issues referred to it by the Division Bench of this Court. The employees/teachers and the College were also granted liberty to raise all their grievances before the Committee which were directly or indirectly connected with the reference, and the Committee was directed to pass an order thereon.

8. The UGC reconstituted the Committee on 22<sup>nd</sup> October, 2025, and its first meeting was convened for 10<sup>th</sup> November, 2025. The Petitioner thereafter submitted a representation dated 22<sup>nd</sup> January, 2026 and a further representation by email dated 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2026.

9. Mr. Abhik Chimni, counsel for the Petitioner, submits that the aforesaid representations have neither been acknowledged nor decided till date, and that the Petitioner has not been informed of any further meeting of the Committee or any timeline for disposal thereof. He submits that the limited prayer of the Petitioner is for a direction to the UGC to ensure that the aforesaid representations are considered and decided in a time-bound manner.

10. In view of the limited nature of the relief sought, which is non-



adversarial and is confined to consideration and decision of the pending representations, and does not entail any adjudication by this Court on the merits of the Petitioner's claim, the Court finds it appropriate to grant the aforesaid relief, notwithstanding that the UGC is not represented before the Court today.

11. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the UGC to ensure that the Petitioner's representations dated 22<sup>nd</sup> January, 2026 and 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2026 are considered and decided by the Expert Committee reconstituted by the UGC, having regard to the directions contained in *Papori Kanwar*, within a period of six weeks from today.

12. The present petition, along with any pending application(s), stands disposed of in the above terms.

**SANJEEV NARULA, J**

**AUGUST 25, 2026**

as

---

<sup>4</sup> SLP (C) No. 27873/2017.