

\$~95

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

+ W.P.(C) 6694/2018 & CM No. 25437/2018 (directions)

ADESH MEDICAL COLLEGE & HOSPITAL Petitioner

Through Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, Senior Advocate
along with Mr. J.S. Bhasin, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS Respondents

Through Mr. S.D. Windlesh, Advocate for
UOI.

Mr. Vikas Singh, Senior Advocate
along with Mr. T. Singhdev, Ms. M.
Biakthansangi Das, Ms. Amandeep
Kaurs, Mr. Tarun Verma, Mr. Abhijit
Chakravarty and Ms. Manpreet Kaur,
Advocates for respondent No. 2/MCI.
Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, AAG, State of
Haryana along with Mr. Shashwat
Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.
3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SIDDHARTH MRIDUL

ORDER

% **27.08.2018**

This Court vide Order dated 9th May, 2018 in W.P.(C) No. 4895/2018, titled as “*Adesh Medical College & Hospital vs. Union of India & Anr.*”, had directed as follows:-

“At this stage, Mr. T.Singhdev, learned counsel, who appears on advance notice for the respondent no.2 submits that the respondent no.2 had already reconsidered the matter and sent its fresh recommendation, with the approval of the over-sight committee to the respondent no.1 on 07.05.2018. He

further submits that it is now for the respondent no.1 to take a considered decision on the petitioner's application.

Mr. Ripudaman S.Bhardwaj, learned counsel, who appears for the respondent no.1 submits that the respondent no.1 is already seized of the matter and is considering the recommendations received from the respondent no.2. He, therefore, prays for two weeks time to pass an appropriate order on the petitioner's application.

However keeping in view, the timeline as laid down in the regulation, I am of the considered view that the respondents ought to decide the petitioner's application in an expeditious manner. The respondent no.1 is accordingly directed to take a final decision on the petitioner's application by passing a reasoned and speaking order within a period of ten days and communicate the same to the petitioner and its counsel.

Needless to say, in case, the petitioner is aggrieved by the decision taken by respondent no.1, it will be open for the petitioner to take legal recourse as permissible under law.

The present petition alongwith pending applications is disposed of in the above terms."

(emphasis supplied)

In this petition, the principle submission made on behalf of the petitioner is to the effect that, the directions contained in the said order dated 9th May, 2018, have not been complied with, inasmuch as, the Central Government has not rendered a final decision on the petitioner's application, by passing a reasoned and speaking order.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Union of India, after making some submissions states that, they shall decide the petitioner's application by passing a reasoned and speaking order, in terms of the earlier

directions issued by this Court in the said order dated 9th May, 2018, within a period of ten days from today, in accordance with law and under intimation to the petitioner. The above directions are in consonance with the ratio of the following decisions rendered by this Court:-

- 1. *Delhi Transport Corporation vs. Ashok Kumar Sharma in W.P.(C) No. 7661/2010 dated 12th March, 2013.***
- 2. *Jugal Kishore vs. Lieutenant Governor, Delhi & Anr. in W.P.(C) No. 1828/2015 dated 25th August, 2015.***

Directed accordingly.

No further directions are called for in the present petition.

The writ petition is disposed of accordingly. Pending application is also disposed of.

Copy of this order be given *dasti* under signature of the Court Master to learned counsel for the parties.

SIDDHARTH MRIDUL, J

AUGUST 27, 2018
RS