

The Hon'ble Sri Justice V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
and
The Hon'ble Sri Justice M. GANGA RAO

+ WRIT PETITION No.698 OF 2018

%Date:05.01.2018

Between:

Shaik Sameena Beebi D/ o. Shaik Abdul Rahman,
Aged 17 years, R/ o. Near Govt. High School,
Block No.1, F.No.1, Madhapur Police Lines,
Madhapur, Hyderabad.
Petitioner being Minor, Rep. by her father
Shaik Abdul Rahman S/ o. Shaik Nasar Ahmed,
Aged about 44 years, Occ: Employee.

...Petitioner

Vs.

\$ The State of Telangana, Rep. by its
Principal Secretary, Medical Health and Family
Welfare, Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

... Respondents

! Counsel for Petitioner : M/ s. P.Padmavathi

^ Counsel for Respondent No.1 : G.P. for Medical Health Family
Welfare

^ Counsel for Respondent No.2 : Sri A. Prabhakar Rao,
Standing Counsel for R-2

^ Counsel for Respondent No.3 : Standing Counsel for C.G.

< Gist :

> Head Note :

? Cases Referred : Nil

HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

AND

HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE M. GANGA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.698 OF 2018

ORDER: (per V. Ramasubramanian, J)

The petitioner, who applied for admission to the medical course for the academic year 2017-18, under the quota reserved for NCC candidates, has come up with the above writ petition contending that her merit in NCC category has not been properly considered.

2. Heard Smt. P. Padmavathi, learned counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Prabhakar Rao, learned Standing Counsel takes notice for the 2nd respondent.

3. The admissions for the current academic year were over long back, on 31.08.2017. In respect of few cases, the last date for admission was extended by the Supreme Court upto 4th or 7th September, 2017.

4. The grievance of the petitioner is two fold, namely, that the NCC grade of the 4th respondent was frequently changed and the 4th respondent who is a less meritorious candidate, was given a higher NCC status and granted admission. The second grievance of the petitioner is that this information was belatedly furnished to her, only in December 2017 and that therefore, the delay in approaching the Court cannot be attributed to the petitioner.


5. Let us assume for a minute that the respondents have committed two mistakes, namely, that of granting admission to a candidate whose grade is lesser than that of the petitioner in NCC and who was less meritorious than the petitioner and let us also assume that

the information sought by the petitioner was furnished only on 12.12.2017.

6. Even with these two presumptions this Court is not entitled to give a direction to the respondents to grant admission to the petitioner for the current academic year 2017-18. The Court cannot also give a direction to grant admission next year, as the Rules of the game in respect of the admissions to professional courses keep changing, with NEET taking place year after year.

7. The only alternative in such cases would be to consider the grant of compensation. But that cannot also be done, unless the petitioner has come up before the Court before the cut-off date and the Court for some reason was unable to grant a relief before cut-off date.

8. The writ petition is therefore dismissed. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand dismissed. No order as to costs.



V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

M. GANGA RAO, J

January 05, 2018
KTL