

\$~39

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10306/2017**

ARYAN ARYA AND ORS

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr Kumar Mukesh and Mr Sajan K.
Singh, Advs

versus

G G S INDRAPRASHTA UNIVERSITY AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Harsh Kaushik, Adv for R-1

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

% **20.11.2017**

CM No. 42048/2017

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

Application disposed of.

W.P.(C) 10306/2017 and CM No. 42047/2017

There are five petitioners before this court. Each of them is seeking an admit card to appear in the Semester examination (academic year 2017-18) of their college i.e. respondent No. 2 (affiliated to University – respondent No. 1). Submission is that the examinations are scheduled from tomorrow i.e., w.e.f 21.11.2017 to 23.11.2017. Petitioners admit cards have been withheld. They be permitted to give the examination and this order may be passed

subject to the outcome of the writ petition.

On advance notice, learned counsel for the respondent has put in appearance. Learned counsel for the respondent points out that there is an acute shortage of attendance qua each of the five petitioners and they not having fulfilled the criteria for admission which clearly provides that each student must have 75% attendance, petitioners are not eligible to be granted their admit cards.

Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly concedes that each of the petitioners has not attended their classes regularly and there is a shortage of attendance qua each of them. The five petitioners are present in court.

Qua the first petitioner, on a query put to the petitioner he informs this court that he has attended 4-5 classes out of the total of 207 lectures. Qua the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th petitioners (present in court and separately queried) each of them have also admitted that they have attended 2, 4-5, 38 classes and last petitioner had attended 5-6 classes. This was out of a total of 200 lectures delivered.

On another query put to the petitioners, their submission is that they had not attended these classes because they were interning with a lawyer at the Tis Hazari Courts. Admittedly there being a shortage of attendance qua each of them, this Court is definitely not inclined to condone their not attending classes and substituting them for an internship which was not the mandate of their course; it does not entitle them to a grant of a prayer in their favour.

Admittedly, the criteria of respondent No. 1 for promotion to the next semester is a 75% attendance. The attendance of each of the

five petitioners as noted supra is much less. They have admitted these facts. Such an indiscipline calls for no sympathetic approach.

Petition is without merit.

Dismissed.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

NOVEMBER 20, 2017
SU