

\$~6

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 230/2012

HARIS-UL-HAQ

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.K. Saini and Ms. Minal Sehgal,
Advocates.

versus

JAMIA MILLIA ISLAMIA

THROUGH ITS VICE CHANCELLOR AND ORS Respondents

Through: Mr. Apurb and Ms. Meenu Pandey,
Advocates for R-1 to 4.

Mr. Ravinder Agarwal, Advocate for
R-5.

Ms. Archana Gaur, Advocate for R-6.

Mr. M. Atyab Siddiqui, Advocate for
R-7.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDERSHAN KUMAR MISRA

ORDER

%

31.03.2016

Counsel for the petitioner has handed over an additional affidavit of the petitioner at the Bar. The same is taken on record. A copy of the same has also been handed over to counsel for respondent Nos. 1 to 4, who are the main contesting respondents, in the Court today.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that on 30th March, 2016, he had made a representation to the Executive Council in terms of

Section 31 of the Jamia Millia Islamia Act, 1988, praying for re-examination of the impugned decision of the Board of Management whilst also requesting for an enquiry in the matter. He submits that so long as the said representation to the Executive Council is duly considered as per law and also in accordance with the relevant rules and regulations; and disposed off with a speaking order; he does not wish to press this matter on merits any further before this Court, whilst reserving the right of the petitioner to take all actions that may be available to him in law after the decision of Executive Council on this representation, in case he is so advised.

Counsel for the respondent also has no objection to the same.

Consequently the petition is disposed off with a direction to the Executive Council to consider the representation of the petitioner on its own merits in accordance with the applicable rules & regulations and as per law. The representation be disposed off within three months by a speaking order. It will be open to the Executive Council to give an adequate opportunity to all the persons likely to be affected before arriving at its conclusion.

Needless to say, in case the petitioner remains dissatisfied with the outcome, it would be open to the petitioner to initiate appropriate proceedings as per law, including, *inter alia*, on the grounds raised in the instant petition.

It is made clear that the merits of the matter have neither been gone into nor examined one way or the other.

The petition stands disposed off accordingly. All interim orders stand vacated.

A copy of the order be given *dasti*.

SUDERSHAN KUMAR MISRA, J

MARCH 31, 2016

AK