

\$~1

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4496/2019**

MEDHAVI KIRSHNA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr Pankaj Sinha, Ms Srishti Thukral,
Advocates.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Mr Prang
Newmai, Advocate for University of Delhi.
Ms Bakshi Vinita with Mr Anand K. P. Bakshi,
Advocates for R-3/UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

23.05.2019

CM APPL. 20040/2019

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4496/2019 & CM APPL. 20041/2019, 20042/2019

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying that directions be issued to the respondents to admit the petitioner in 'Jubilee Hall Hostel' of Delhi University.
4. The petitioner is a differently abled person and claims that he is entitled to preferential treatment for grant of hostel accommodation. It is his case that the petitioner was eligible for grant of hostel accommodation for the academic year 2017-18, but his case was not considered. The petitioner

had also filed an application before the Court of Chief Commissioner of Persons with Disabilities, which was disposed of by an order dated 27.08.2018.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has drawn the attention of this Court to paragraph 19 of the said order, whereby observations were made to the effect that the petitioner's case should be considered for the academic session 2018-19 on the basis of his ranking for the year 2017-18. The petitioner claims that the said observations have not been complied with.

6. Mr Rupal, learned counsel appearing for respondent no.1 University states, on instructions, that the petitioner's case was considered for allotment of hostel accommodation on the basis of the recommendation made by the Chief Commissioner of Persons with Disabilities, however, the petitioner could not be accommodated since he did not rank high enough in the order of merit. He states that ten students in the category of persons with disabilities were admitted and each one of the said students was ranked in higher order of merit than the petitioner. In view of the above, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.

7. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner states that no information has been provided to the petitioner and therefore the petitioner has been unable to verify whether the petitioner was considered and was rejected on account of being lower in the order of merit.

8. In view of the above, this Court directs respondent no.1 and 2 to provide the petitioner with complete details of the order of merit not only of the petitioner but other candidates as well, including those admitted to the hostel. Needless to state that if the petitioner has any grievance in this

regard, he is at liberty to apply.

9. The petition and the pending applications are disposed of.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

MAY 23, 2019

pkv