

\$~35

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

+ **W.P.(C) 85/2016**

BRAHMA PRAKASH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Brahma Prakash, Advocate

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

08.01.2016

CM No.450/2016 (Exemption)

1. Allowed subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 85/2016

2. The writ petitioner has sought six substantial reliefs. The same are set out hereinbelow :-

“(a). Directing respondent to admit petitioner in 2nd year of LLM 3 year course from 1st year of LLM 2015-16 to save a precious year of petitioner’s career.

(b). Directing respondent to allow petitioner to appear in examination during May / June 2016 for 2 papers of 2nd semester and 2 papers of 4th semester of LLM 2014-15 admission and during supplementary examination 2016 remaining 1 paper of Ist / IIIrd semester with remedial classes and attendance.

(c). Directing respondent to allow petitioner to be admitted in 3rd year of LLM academic session 2016-17

without any hindrance of rules of promotions of the respondent to become at par with the students admitted in LLM 2014-15.

(d). Directing respondent to allow petitioner to appear in supplementary examinations to be held during 2016 for his remaining papers of Ist to 4th semester to complete his LLM in time at par with the students admitted in LLM 2014-15.

(e). Directing respondent to give petitioner all the remedial actions to become at par with other students of LLM 2014-2015 academic session.

(f). Directing respondent to pay the amount of Rs.5,00,000/- by the respondent in favour of petitioner as award of compensation for every loss, shocks, inconveniences and mental agony effected from the refusal of admission in the LLM 2014-15 course and other consequential sufferings to the petitioner in this regard...”

2.1 A perusal of the prayers made, would show, that the petitioner is seeking reliefs based on the fact that though he had cleared the 2014 LL.M. entrance examination, he had been wrongly denied admission in that year. The record filed shows that the petitioner, thereafter sat for the entrance examination in 2015 and having cleared the exam joined the LL.M. 2015 batch.

2.2 The petitioner avers that delay in approaching the court was caused on account of the fact that he had taken recourse to the RTI route.

2.3 To my mind, there is no reason why the petitioner ought not to have approached the court for an appropriate relief at the earliest.

2.4 The learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to explain the delay

by alluding to the representations made to the Vice Chancellor.

3. In my opinion, mere filing of representations, which are not followed up, quickly enough, with an appropriate action in court cannot come to the aid of the petitioner.

4. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

JANUARY 08, 2016

yg