

\$~48

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 18.09.2019

+ W.P.(C) 10134/2019

NARSINGOJU VISHAL & ORS

..... Petitioners

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI THROUGH CHIEF ELECTION
OFFICER & ORS

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner: Petitioners in person.

For the Respondent: Mr.Mohinder J.S.Rupal with Mr.Prang Newmai, Advocates

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPL.41871/2019 (exemption)

Exemption is allowed subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 10134/2019

1. Petitioners seek a mandamus directing the respondents to re-conduct the Student's Union Elections of the Delhi University.
2. It is contended by the petitioners that they were eligible voters duly admitted to the 3rd Year of Law Centre – I of Faculty of law, Delhi University and when they attempted to cast their votes, they

were prevented from casting their votes.

3. Petitioners, who appear in person, submit that no reason was communicated to the petitioners as to why they were prevented from casting their votes. It is pointed out that representations/complaint was given to the Grievance Redressal Cell on 12.09.2019. Thereafter, an email has been sent on 14.09.2019 and 16.09.2019, however, till date no communication has been received and no action has been taken on the said complaint.

4. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by learned counsel appearing for the respondents.

5. Since the election of the Delhi University has already been held and the petitioners admittedly were not candidates, no direction can be issued in this petition setting aside the election by this Court at this stage.

6. Para 6.8.4 of the Lyngdoh Committee's Report reads as under:

"6.8.4 Members of the Grievance cell are prohibited from filing complaints. Any other student may file a complaint with the Grievance cell, within a period of 3 weeks from the date of declaration of results. All complaints must be filed under the name of the student filing the complaint. The Grievance cell shall act on all complaints within 24 hours after they are received by either dismissing them or calling a hearing."

7. In terms of Para 6.8.4 of the Lyngdoh Committee's Report, since the petitioners have given representations to the Grievance

Redressal Cell, it is obligatory on the part of the Grievance Redressal Cell to act on the complaint of the petitioners within 24 hours either by dismissing it or by calling a hearing.

8. Since the petitioners have made complaints to the Grievance Redressal Cell, in the first instance the Grievance Redressal Cell is liable to be directed to act in accordance with Para 6.8.4 of the Lyngdoh Committee's Report.

9. The Petition is, accordingly, disposed of with a direction to the Grievance Redressal Cell to act in accordance with Para 6.8.4 of the Lyngdoh Committee's Report.

10. It would be open to the Grievance Redressal Cell to pass an appropriate order in terms of the Lyngdoh Committee's Report, if any merit is found in the complaints of the petitioners in terms of the said report without being influenced by anything stated in this order.

11. It is clarified that this Court has neither considered nor expressed any opinion on the merits of the claim of the petitioners.

12. Petition is, accordingly, disposed of in the above terms.

13. Order *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

SEPTEMBER 18, 2019/rk