

\$~42

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

+ W.P.(C) 1491/2018 & CM No.6127/2018

NIMRA EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY AND ANR. Petitioners

Through: Mr.Sandeep Sethi, Sr. Adv. with
Mr.Amit Kumar, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. Respondents

Through: Ms.Monika Arora with Mr.Kushal
Kumar, Advs. for UOI.
Mr.T. Singhdev with Mr.Tarun
Verma, Ms.B. Das, Ms.Puja Sarkar &
Mr.Abhijeet Chakrabarti, Advs. for
R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

%

16.02.2018

The petitioner herein is aggrieved by the decision taken by respondent No.2 recommending the disapproval of the scheme for renewal of permission of admission of 3rd Batch of 150 MBBS students for the academic year 2018-19 in petitioner-institute.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No.1 informed the factum of recommendation of disapproval to the petitioner and granted them an opportunity of being heard on 18.12.2017 after which the petitioner has, in response to the queries raised, submitted another representation dated 10.01.2018 not only to the respondent No.1, but also to

the Oversight Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the respondent no.1 has till date not communicated any decision taken thereon.

Ms.Monika Arora, learned counsel appearing for respondent no.1 on advance notice, submits that the matter is under active consideration of the respondent no.1 and prays for three weeks time to dispose of the petitioner's representation. However, keeping in view the fact that in the present case, the timeline prescribed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for admission to Medical Colleges, has to be strictly adhered to, I deem it appropriate to dispose of this petition with a direction to respondent no.1 to decide the petitioner's representation within a period of two weeks by passing a reasoned and speaking order. A copy of the same shall be supplied to the petitioner.

However, it is made clear that in case respondent No.1 is of the view that there are certain further clarifications required from the petitioner, it would be open to them to call the petitioner for a personal hearing.

In case the petitioner is aggrieved by the order passed by the respondent no.1, it will open to it to take legal recourse as permissible under law. Needless to say that the present order is being passed without prejudice to the respective rights and contentions of the parties.

The writ petition along with all pending application is disposed with the aforesaid directions.

A copy of this order be given **dasti** under the signatures of Court Master.

FEBRUARY 16, 2018/gm

REKHA PALLI, J

FEBRUARY 16, 2018/gm