

\$~164

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

% Judgment delivered on: 05.10.2016

+ **W.P.(C) 8601/2016**

AJAY MAURYA AND ORS

..... Petitioners

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner

: Dr.S.N.Singh and Mr Atul Singh, Advocates.

For the Respondent

: Ms J.S.Rupal and Ms Simran Jeet, Advocates for Delhi University.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. Insofar as petitioner No.1 is concerned, the writ petition was dismissed qua him on 03.10.2016.
2. The petitioners seek mandamus directing the respondent to take on record their documents and to grant them admission in the LL.B. Course commencing from the Academic Session 2016-2017.
3. The petitioners could not produce the provisional certificate at

the time when the petitioners were invited for counseling, i.e. on 26.08.2016. The result of the petitioner No.2 in the qualifying graduation examination was declared on 26.07.2016. It is contended that the Petitioner No. 2 had applied for issuance of the provisional certificate from the concerned University on 26.08.2016 and the provisional certificate has been issued on 26.09.2016. Similarly, in the case of the petitioner No.3, the result was declared in June, 2016 and the provisional certificate was applied only in August, 2016. Insofar as petitioner No.4 is concerned, no documents pertaining to graduation were submitted at the time of counseling.

4. It is an admitted position that the documents required to be submitted by the petitioners at the time of counseling were not submitted.

5. In identical circumstances, by judgment dated 04.10.2016, in W.P.(C) No.8905/2016 titled **Rahul Kumar Singh versus University of Delhi & Ors.**, this court has held that Degree not collected cannot be equated with Degree not issued. It has also been held that the Information Bulletin makes it mandatory for the candidates to report with the documents in original at the specified date and time for counseling failing which they will forfeit their claim for admission.

6. The ratio of the said judgment in **Rahul Kumar Singh** (*supra*) is squarely applicable in the facts of the present case also.

7. Further, the contention of the petitioners that the respondents have granted admission to other students out of turn and have entertained candidates in the first list, even after the subsequent lists have been issued, is disputed by the counsel for the respondent, who submits that no candidate has been considered out of turn and the policy has been uniformly applied.

8. In the absence of any cogent material being produced by the petitioners, I am unable to accept this contention.

9. In view of the ratio in the case of Rahul Kumar Singh (Supra), I find no merit in the writ petition, the same is dismissed.

OCTOBER 05, 2016
‘sn’

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J