

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 4/2/2021

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

Writ Petition No.16893 of 2020
a n d
M.P.No.20958 of 2020

J. Drusillin Joomy ... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Dental Council of India
rep. By its Secretary
Aiwan-E-Galib Marg
Kolta Road, Temple Lane
New Delhi 110 002.
2. The Tamil Nadu Dr.M.G.R.Medical University
rep. By its Registrar
69 Anna Salai, Guindy
Chennai 600 032.
3. The Principal
Saveetha Dental College
Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical
Sciences University (SIMATS)
162 Poonamallee High Road
Chennai 600 077.
4. The Principal
Sri Mookambika Institute of Dental Science
Padanilam, Kulasekharam
Kanyakumari District 629 161 ... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a writ of certiorarified mandamus to call for the records relating to the impugned proceedings issued by the first respondent Dental Council of India in No.DE-Academic/114 (Migration)/2020 dated 14/9/2020 quash the same and further direct the 1st Respondent to approve forthwith the petitioner's application seeking Migration from the third respondent College, namely, Saveetha Dental College, Chennai to the fourth respondent College, namely, Sree Mookambika Institute of Dental Science, Kulasekharam, Kanyakumari District.

For petitioner ... Mr.T.Cibi Chakraborty

For respondents ... Mr.Haja Mohideen Gisthi
for R.1.

Mr.Ravichandran
Standing Counsel
for R.2

Mr.Godson Issac for R.4

ORDER

This writ petition is filed against the order dated 14/9/2020, made in DE-Academic/114 (Migration)/2020 by the Dental Council of India, wherein the request of the petitioner seeking migration from the third respondent college, viz., Saveetha Dental College, Chennai, to the fourth respondent college, viz., Sri Mookambika Institute of Dental Science, Kanyakumari District, has been rejected, on the ground that migration sought for by the petitioner is against the Dental Council of India Regulation, 2007.

2. As per the Regulation, Migration is permitted from recognised Dental College to recognised Dental College only when the candidate apply for migration within a period of one month after passing the first year BDS on compassionate ground criteria i.e., (i). Death of supporting guardian and (ii). Disturbed conditions as declared by Government in the Dental College area.

3. The petitioner who is the native of Nagercoil, got admission in the third respondent College for the five year BDS Degree course in the academic year 2018 - 2019. During the end of the first year course, she was diagnosed with Polycystic Ovaries and the petitioner suffered abnormal urine bleeding at irregular intervals with severe muscle cramps. She was under serious medication and on frequent follow up from the Doctor at Kanyakumari District and she completed her first year course. The petitioner made a request for migration from the third respondent College to the fourth respondent College depending on her health condition.

4. Considering the medical condition, vide, letter, dated 17/7/2020, the third respondent has given No Objection for migration, permitting the petitioner to continue her remaining course in any other Dental Colleges, recognised and approved by the Dental Council of India. With this No Objection

certificate, the petitioner has approached the fourth respondent College. Having vacancy in the second year BDS course, the fourth respondent is also willing to take the admission of this petitioner, vide, letter, dated 19/8/2020.

5. In view of the no objection certificate issued by the respective transferor college and the transferee College, the petitioner made a request to the Dental Council for their approval. The request of this petitioner was rejected, by impugned order, dated 14/9/2020, on the ground that the petitioner does not fulfill the provision of BDS Course Regulations, 2007.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, placed reliance on a judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in The Dental Council of India - Vs - Trishanthi M.N. & Anr. (W.A. No.1435/2018 - Dated 9.7.2018) it has been held as follows:-

"Having given thoughtful consideration to the submissions made and having examined the record with reference to the law applicable, we are not inclined to consider interference in the order passed by the learned Single Judge in this case.

The relevant part of BDS Regulations, 2007, pertaining to migration, reads as under:

"IV. Migration:

1. Migration from one dental college to another is not a right of a student. However, migration of students from one dental college to another dental college in India may be considered by the Dental Council of India. Only in exceptional cases on extreme Compassionate grounds*, provided the following criteria are fulfilled. Routine migrations on other ground shall not be allowed.

(2) Both the colleges, i.e. one at which the student is studying at present and one to which migration is sought, are recognized by the Dental Council of India.

(3) The applicant candidate should have passed first professional BDS examination.

(4) The applicant candidate submits his application for migration, complete in all respects, to all

authorities concerned within a period of one month of passing (declaration of results) the first professional Bachelor of Dental Surgery (BDS) examination.

(5) The applicant candidate must submit an affidavit stating that he/she will pursue 240 days of prescribed study before appearing at IInd professional Bachelor of Dental Surgery (BDS) examination at the transferee dental college, which should be duly certified by the Registrar of the concerned University in which he/she is seeking transfer. The transfer will be applicable only after receipt of the affidavit.

Note 1:

- (i) Migration is permitted only in the beginning of IInd year BDS Course in recognised Institutions.
- (ii) All applications for migration shall be referred to Dental Council of India by the college authorities. No Institution/University shall allow migration directly without the prior approval of the Council.
- (iii) Council reserves the right not to entertain any application which is not under the prescribed compassionate grounds and also to take independent decisions where applicant has been allowed to migrate without referring the same to the Council.

Note 2: *Compassionate ground criteria.

- (i) Death of supporting guardian.
- (ii) Disturbed conditions as declared by Government in the Dental College area."

In the case of Dr. Anand Rai (supra), the Madhya Pradesh High Court was essentially considering the issues raised before it that the benefit of migration was being allowed in undeserving cases to the children and relatives of ministers and officers, while the same was being denied to others. In the given circumstances, and to curb the improper and rather questionable implementation of Regulations, the Madhya Pradesh High Court observed and directed as under:

"It is also observed that the provisions relating to migration provided under the Regulations framed

by the M.C.I. and D.C.I. have to be strictly adhered to and the benefit thereunder can only be granted in respect of cases which fall within the parameters contained therein, keeping in mind the other mandatory regulations of the M.C.I. and D.C.I. relating to vacancy of seats, adhering to the teacher student ratio, mid session migrations and the fact as to whether migration from private medical colleges can be granted in Government medical colleges to students who have otherwise been unable to qualify for admission in such Government colleges on merits by adopting the devious method of migration.

However, as both the M.C.I. and D.C.I. have stated before this Court on affidavit that they shall in future be careful and vigilant in exercising this power and that they shall not give any undue benefit to the relatives and children of either ministers, I.A.S. Or IP.S. officers and shall generally apply these regulations to all category and class of students and as on date, we are not required to examine the validity of any order of migration in the present petition, the petition filed by the petitioner is disposed of with a direction to the M.C.I. and the D.C.I. to strictly adhere to the regulations relating to migration, by implement them in a uniform manner without discrimination and ensuring that they are not utilized for the purposes of granting benefit only to high placed individuals and that they are exercised only in cases which fulfill the criteria laid down and prescribed under the M.C.I. and D.C.I. Regulations.

With the aforesaid observations/directions, the petition filed by the petitioner stand disposed of."

The matter before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in C.A.No.18766/2017 had been of appeal against an interim order passed by the Division Bench of Delhi High Court. In the said case, the learned Single Judge of the High Court did not interfere with the decision of DCI in declining to provide for migration on health grounds. However, in appeal, the Division Bench, even while issuing notices, passed an interim order of mandatory nature, whereby it was enjoined upon the authorities to allow the migration, as prayed for.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court did not approve of such a mandatory order that was passed without considering the Regulations and the applicable decisions and at the interim stage. Hence, while setting aside such an interim order, the Supreme Court directed the High Court to dispose of the intra Court appeal at an early date.

We may also take note of the fact that the said intra Court appeal before the Delhi High Court was ultimately decided on 08.05.2018, where the Division Bench took the view that the aforementioned Note 2 of the Regulations, even while elaborating on the criteria of extreme compassion for migration, restricted the discretion of DCI to only two given conditions. The Division Bench of Delhi High Court also pointed out that the challenge to the aforesaid two conditions was not being considered, for the appellant seeking the aid of general regulations permitting the DCI to authorize migration on the ground of extreme compassion. In the result, the Court declined to interfere in the exercise of discretion by the DCI, which had taken into account the medical records of the candidate.

In contrast to the above decision of the Delhi High Court, it is noticed that in the case of Fathima Thameema PK (supra), which was relied upon by the learned Single Judge, the Division Bench of Madras High Court found the case of writ petitioner therein to be that of degeneration of L4, L5 and L5-S1 disc bulge and as per medical report, her condition was to aggravate upon undertaking 84 kms of travel everyday. In that case, the Division Bench of Madras High Court approved the view of the Single Judge that the referred Regulation was not an exhaustive one and the writ petitioner's case was to be viewed with compassion in view of her health condition. The order passed by the Supreme Court in the case of Anhad Raj Singh (supra) was also cited to which, the Madras High Court pointed out that therein, the candidate was suffering from asthma, but the medical condition of the writ petitioner was different and severe and was of an exceptional character.

Having examined the law applicable, we are unable to agree with the submissions made on behalf of the appellant that the two circumstances enumerated in Note 2 of the Regulations relating to migration are those of 'only' criteria on which the migration could be allowed.

The said Regulation IV is indeed made for allowing migration from one dental college to another; of course, not as a matter of right and only in exceptional cases on extreme compassionate grounds. Noteworthy it is that the strict requirements towards eligibility for migration have been spelt out in clauses (2) to (5) and then in Note 1 of Regulation IV *ibid.*, giving effective control to the appellant - DCI over the matter and restricting permission to migrate only after completion of the first professional BDS examination and only in the beginning of II year BDS Course.

It is not the case of the appellant that the writ petitioner is otherwise ineligible on any of the conditions mentioned in the said clauses (2) to (5) and Note 1.

As regards the compassionate grounds, we are clearly of the view that the expression 'only' occurring in clause (1) of Regulation IV merely specifies that migration could be allowed only in exceptional cases. With respect, we are unable to find any reason to interpret the said expression to mean that the migration is restricted to the two circumstances mentioned in Note 2 or that migration could never be granted except for the said two circumstances.

On a purposive interpretation of the provisions contained in said Regulation IV, we are clearly of the view that the two grounds mentioned in Note 2, though are of extreme nature i.e., death of the supporting guardian and disturbed condition as declared by the Government in the area in question but then, the said Note 2 cannot be considered to be that of exhaustive enumeration of all the possible grounds for permitting migration on compassionate basis. For its very nature and purport, the said Note 2 could only be considered as illustrative of some of the extreme

compassionate grounds, but we are unable to read in the said Regulations any such restriction that the migration could never be allowed except on the said grounds stated in Note 2.

It needs hardly any emphasis to point out that apart from the two circumstances mentioned in the said Note 2, there could be several other imponderables, which may occur in the life of a candidate and for which, migration may have to be sought for, so as to continue with the studies in an appropriate manner. Extreme conditions of illness and health problems could be one such eventuality. We do not propose to itemize various other conditions, which may ultimately be of handicap for a candidate to properly pursue the studies in one institution and which may reasonably be met by way of migration to an appropriate institution but the possibility of such eventualities cannot be ignored. The fact that there could still be other grounds than those mentioned in Note 2 finds indication in clause (iii) of Note 1, where the appellant - DCI has reserved the right not to entertain any application not falling under the prescribed compassionate ground. The said clause is at least indicative of the fact that there may be an application, which may not fall strictly under the enumerated grounds. The appellant, undoubtedly, carries the right not to entertain any such application but it inheres in such a right that the same would be exercised in a reasonable manner; and, it is not laid down as a rule of thumb that every such application which does not fall strictly under the enumerated grounds has to meet with denial alone, irrespective of the nature of ground for seeking migration. The migration is allowed under the Regulation IV itself, of course, in exceptional cases, but on extreme compassionate ground. When such a proposition is adopted for the reason of compassion towards the candidates, one would only be left to wonder, if an extreme adverse medical condition of a candidate would not evoke compassion?

For what has been discussed hereinabove, with respect, we are unable to follow the decision of the Delhi High Court in Anhad Raj Singh case (supra), where the High Court has proceeded on the assumption that the circumstances stated in Note 2 of Regulation IV are the 'only' grounds on which

migration could be allowed and they restrict the discretion of DCI. In fact, the migration itself is permitted in exceptional cases on extreme compassionate grounds. When it has not been specified in the Regulations that such extreme compassionate grounds are also limited to the circumstances mentioned in Note 2, we find no reason to read any such restriction in the matter of discretion of DCI.

Looking to the object and purpose of the said Regulations, we are inclined to agree with the decision of the Madras High Court in Fathima Thameema PK (supra) that the Regulation IV is not an exhaustive one. In the said case, compassionate ground migration was allowed to the candidate suffering from extreme medical conditions.

The facts of the present case bring forth two peculiarities. One is that the writ petitioner is shown to be suffering from Cervical Spondylitis and has been advised bed rest and to avoid travel. The severity of the referred ailment may vary from person to person, but the case of the writ petitioner had been of troublesome nature, as could be noticed from the fact that the treating hospital has advised her bed rest and to avoid travel.

The other peculiar aspect of the matter is that the writ petitioner is seeking migration from one college in the city of Bengaluru to another college in the same city, but while specifically pointing out that in the college of migration, she would be able to avail hostel facility so as to avoid travel and would be nearer to KIMS Hospital for her treatment.

The reasons and circumstances mentioned by the writ petitioner cannot be said to be of any pretentious projection of her case. On the contrary, the specific reason for migration so as to avail the hostel facility and thereby to avoid travelling as per the medical advice appear to be more of her bona fide. Avoiding travel in a city like Bengaluru by the student who is Cervical Spondylitis patient and who is advised bed rest cannot be ignored as an irrelevant or baseless ground.

It is also noticed that the appellant - DCI, in its impugned endorsement dated 24.10.2017, did not

advert to the ground as stated by the writ petitioner seeking migration, but rejected her prayer only with reference to the aforesaid two circumstances mentioned in Note 2 and then, to the aforesaid decision of the High Court of Madhya Pradesh in Dr. Anand Rai's case. We are unable to approve the approach of the appellant - DCI in rejecting a prayer for migration without even adverting to the ground and the reasons and the circumstances stated by a candidate.

The learned Single Judge has taken into comprehension all the facts and circumstances of the case and has, thereafter, granted the relief to the writ petitioner on relevant considerations. In the given set of facts and circumstances, we are unable to find any such error or infirmity in the order passed by the learned Single Judge, which may call for interference in this intra Court appeal.

In view of the above, the appeal fails and is, therefore, dismissed."

7. In yet another decision in the case of Dental Council of India - Vs - Fathima Thameema PK (2017 SCC OnLine (Mad) 10905), a Division Bench of this Court, relating to similar issue, held as under :-

7. On going through the said regulation, the learned Single Judge appreciated the facts that the writ petitioner was referred to Medical Board and the Medical Board, on examination of the writ petitioner, gave its report to the effect that the petitioner is suffering from lumbar disc disease with degeneration of L4, L5 and L5-S1 disc bulge and that her condition would aggravate if she undertakes travel and finding that she had to travel 84 kms every day, which is not advisable medically, and has come to the conclusion that the petitioner's position fits into the definition of compassionate ground.

8. The learned Single Judge also appreciated the fact that though the governing regulation, viz., Regulation IV speaks only about two grounds, viz., death of supporting guardian and distributed condition as declared

by Government Dental College area, and has rightly held that such regulation is not an exhaustive one and the petitioner's case has to be viewed with compassion only in view of her health condition as evidenced by the proceedings of the Medical Board dated 13/10/2017.

9. So far as the decision relied upon by the learned counsel appearing for the appellant is concerned, we find that it has arisen out of an interim order passed by the Delhi High Court and the candidate concerned therein was said to have been suffering from Asthma, whereas the medical condition of the writ petitioner in the case on hand is very pathetic as she is suffering from lumbar disc disease with degeneration of L4, L5 and L5-S1 disc bulge and that her condition would aggravate if she undertakes travel. Moreover, in the said decision itself, it was observed that the attention of the Court was invited to the earlier decisions which had expounded that such transfer can be only in exceptional situation and that it is not a right of the student.

10. Therefore, we are of the view that the learned Single Judge has rightly observed that the governing Regulation is not an exhaustive one and the petitioner's position fits into the definition of compassionate ground and the petitioner's case has to be viewed with compassion only, in view of her health condition as evidenced by the proceedings of the Medical Board dated 13/10/2017. We do not find any reason to interfere with the said order passed by the learned Single Judge as we find that the petitioner's case, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of its own and the pathetic condition of the petitioner, is an exceptional one for grant of migration. Accordingly, the order passed by the learned Single Judge is confirmed and the appellant Dental Council of India is directed to comply with the order passed by the learned Single Judge within a period of three weeks from today so that the precious time of the student in pursuing the course shall not be wasted.

11. With the above observation, the writ appeal stands disposed of. No costs."

8. In a recent judgment, the First Bench of this Court in W.A.No.482 of 2020, in THE DENTAL COUNCIL OF INDIA, NEW DELHI Vs. 1. PSR LAKSHMI BHUVANESHWARI PREETHI AND 3 OTHERS, paragraph Nos.9 to 12 held as follows:-

9. The limited question that arises for consideration is whether the first Respondent is entitled to the approval of the Dental Council for the proposed migration from the third Respondent to the fourth Respondent College. The BDS Regulations of the Dental Council govern the aforesaid question. The BDS Regulations relating to migration were considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Dental Council of India v. Anhad Raj Singh (2018) 1 SCC 723, wherein the interim order of the Division Bench of the Delhi High Court that directed the authorities to permit the candidate to join the transferee college was reversed not only on the ground that the interim direction amounted to granting the final relief but also because Regulation IV of the BDS Regulations and the objections on that basis were not considered by the Division Bench. On perusal of Note 1(i) of Regulation IV of the BDS regulations, it is clear that migration is permitted only in the beginning of the II year BDS Course in recognized institutions. The proposed migration by the first Respondent is for the purpose of joining in the third year BDS Course in the fourth Respondent College. Apart from Note 1(i), we find that Regulation IV (4) and (5) also provide that the candidate should apply within a stipulated period and also submit an affidavit stating that she will complete 240 days of prescribed study before appearing for the II year examination. These requirements underscore the fact that migration is permissible only at the commencement of the II year. Indeed, the learned single Judge was also conscious of the fact that the BDS Regulations do not permit migration, in these facts and circumstances, and recorded the same in paragraph 10 of the impugned order. Thus, the order of the learned single Judge cannot be sustained and is liable to be set aside.

10. Nevertheless, we note that Regulation IV also stipulates that migration is not a student's right and a request for migration would be considered by the Dental Council only in exceptional cases on extreme compassionate grounds, and that routine migrations on other grounds shall not be allowed. Note 1(iii) stipulates, inter alia, that the "Council reserved the right not to entertain any application which is not under the prescribed compassionate grounds". Note 2 specifies 'compassionate ground criteria' as the death of a supporting guardian or disturbed conditions, as declared by Government, in the Dental College area. The present request for migration is on the basis that the student encountered various problems, as detailed above, in the third Respondent College especially with regard to the demand of exorbitant fees. While the reason for seeking migration does not satisfy the aforementioned prescribed compassionate grounds criteria, this is, undoubtedly, not a request for a routine migration. It also cannot be construed as a whimsical or unreasonable request when the facts and circumstances are viewed in totality. While two compassionate grounds criteria are specified in Note 2 (i) and (ii) of Regulation IV, Note 1 (iii) thereof appears to provide some latitude and discretion to the Dental Council by stipulating that the Dental Council reserves the right to reject an application that does not satisfy the prescribed compassionate grounds criteria. This clause, in our view, confers a discretion but does not impose an obligation on the Dental Council to reject an application that does not meet the prescribed compassionate grounds criteria. Nonetheless, this discretion is intended to be exercised reasonably and non-arbitrarily and the test would always be whether the application for migration satisfies the compassionate grounds requirement, be it on the compassionate grounds criteria prescribed in Note 2 (i) and (ii) or otherwise. For example, a student may be subject to physical violence or sexual harassment in a college and may seek migration for these reasons. In each case, the Dental

Council would have to examine if it qualifies as a compassionate ground by exercising its discretion judiciously. Thus, in our view, the compassionate grounds criteria in Note 2 (i) and (ii) are illustrative and not exhaustive.

11. On the facts of this case, we are acutely conscious of the fact that the student has obtained a transfer certificate from the third Respondent College and her career is likely to be severely affected unless some arrangement is made for the continuation of her education. Keeping in mind this situation and the discussion in the preceding paragraph, in case the first Respondent is willing to join the II year BDS course and the fourth Respondent College is willing to admit her in the II year, we grant leave to the first Respondent to make a fresh representation to the Dental Council through the Dr. M.G.R. Medical University for permission to migrate by joining the II year of the BDS course. Upon receipt of such representation, the Dental Council is directed to consider the same in light of the observations contained herein and pass orders thereon on merits within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of such representation. Before parting with the case, we note that the facts and circumstances set out above highlight the necessity for the Dental Council to revisit the BDS Regulations on migration so as to create a frame work that ensures high standards of dental education while also enabling migration, on reasonable grounds, in a wider range of situations.

9. Mr.Haja Mohideen Gisthi, learned counsel appearing for the Dental Council of India made his submissions by referring the reason for migration, and the Regulations. However, he admits that pursuant to the orders passed by the Division Bench of this Court as also the Karnataka High Court, Dental Council of India has addressed the Secretary to Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, vide letter dated 22.2.2019, along with the revised BDS Course Regulations (9th Amendment) Regulations, 2018, for necessary amendment to the Regulation. The same is under the consideration of the Government of India. The Dental Council of India is also following it with the Government with frequent reminders and a last reminder was made on 8/1/2021.

10. The First Bench of this Court in Lakshmi Bhuvaneswari Preethi's case (supra), had observed that it is time for the Dental Council of India to revisit the Regulation and comprehensively make amendments with regard to migration on compassionate grounds by prescribing the grounds that would fall within the ambit of compassionate grounds and not to go merely on the present prescription as the facts and circumstances of each and every case requires to be looked into in proper perspective before a decision is taken by the Dental Council of India on the request for migration.

11. Further, it is not out of context here to point out that even according to the Dental Council of India, the matter relating to amendment is pending before the Government for necessary action since long. In such a scenario, it would not be prudent for the Dental Council of India to keep the issue in the present case pending, awaiting the outcome of the amendment to be made by the Government and instead, the Dental Council of India, taking into consideration the medical condition of the petitioner requires to act immediately, so that the petitioner's health condition does not deteriorate any further.

12. On a careful consideration of the totality of the circumstances, it reveals that the petitioner is suffering from Polycystic Ovaries, and inspite of the acute medical condition, which harms her health, the petitioner is intending to pursue her studies, which has necessitated her to take the pains to approach both the 3rd and 4th respondent college for necessary No Objection Certificates and the 3rd and 4th respondent colleges, having found the medical condition of the petitioner warrants permitting the migration, has given the No Objection Certificate to the petitioner.

13. It is also to be borne in by the 1st respondent that the future prospects of the petitioner hinges on the approval that is to be granted by the 1st respondent, else the studies of the petitioner would be gravely affected and she would be prejudiced if she is deprived the migration from the 3rd respondent to the 4th respondent college, which would have a detrimental effect on her education and further career. Red tapism in the form of regulations, as noted above, should not be a stumbling block for the motivated candidates to pursue their education. In such a backdrop, the Dental Council of India, cutting across the red tape, is bound to take a decision keeping in mind the overall medical condition of the petitioner in the light of the decisions of the Court referred to above and take an affirmative and positive decision in favour of the petitioner relating to her migration from the 3rd respondent to 4th respondent college.

14. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, the impugned order of rejection passed by the 1st respondent/Dental Council of India is hereby set aside and the matter is remanded back to the Dental Council of India/the 1st respondent herein for taking a decision afresh on the basis of the materials and also keeping in mind the orders passed by the Courts relating to migration, which have been discussed above as also the decision in the present case and shall pass orders on the migration of the petitioner from the 3rd respondent to the 4th respondent college within a period of three weeks, from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Further, the 1st respondent is also directed to take steps to have the amendment to the Regulations carried out at the earliest so that the deserving candidates be not made to run from pillar to post seeking for migration which will have a detrimental effect on their studies.

15. This writ petition is disposed of, with the aforesaid observations and directions. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mvs.
To

The Secretary,
Dental Council of India,
Aiwan-E-Galib Marg,
Kolta Road, Temple Lane,
New Delhi 110 002.

+1cc to M/s.S.Haja Mohideen Gisthi, Advocate Sr.6144

+2cc to M/s.Isaac Chambers, Advocate Sr.6523

Writ Petition No.16893 of 2020

ss[col]
srg 08/02/2021