

\$~6

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

+ W.P.(C) 5265/2017

AURA FOUNDATION Petitioner

Through: Mr.Sanjay Sehrawat, Adv.

versus

REHABILITATION COUNCIL OF INDIA Respondent

Through: Ms.Anuja Saxena, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.HARI SHANKAR

ORDER

% **12.06.2017**

1. The present writ petition is essentially directed against a communication/order dated 03rd May, 2017 issued by the Rehabilitation Council of India, rejecting the request, of the petitioner, for extension of permission to hold the D.E.d.Spl.Ed.(HI) course for the academic Session 2017-18.
2. Admittedly, the said decision has been taken on the basis of a joint assessment report which was submitted by a team of visiting experts, which, according to the impugned communication, exposes various shortcomings in essential parameters in the college run by the petitioner.
3. Mr.Sanjay Sehrawat, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that no copy of the said joint assessment report was made available to the petitioner, and no opportunity was granted to the petitioner, to represent thereagainst, before the passing of the impugned communication dated 03rd May, 2017.
4. Ms.Anuja Saxena, Advocate for the respondent emphasises that there

is no requirement, in law, for grant of any such opportunity.

5. My attention has also been drawn to the fact that, after issuance of the impugned communication dated 03rd May, 2017, the petitioner had submitted a detailed representation dated 20th May, 2017 thereagainst, addressed to the Member Secretary of the Rehabilitation Council of India, a copy of which is annexed as Annexure P-9 to the writ petition. Apparently, the said representation has not elicited any response till date.

6. In the circumstances, with the consent of the parties, the present writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent to take a decision on the above mentioned representation dated 20th May, 2017, submitted by the petitioner to the Member Secretary of the respondent, and annexed as Annexure P-9 to the writ petition within two weeks, and furnish a copy thereof to the petitioner. The petitioner is also permitted to participate in the said exercise by deputing its representative to offer any assistance, which the respondent may require for the purpose of disposing of the said representation at a mutually convenient date and time.

7. Needless to say, in case the decision on the representation of the petitioner is adverse to its interests, the petitioner would be at liberty to avail all remedies available to it in law.

8. With the above observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

9. *Dasti.*

**C. HARI SHANKAR.
(VACATION JUDGE)**

**JUNE 12, 2017
neelam**