



2024 : DHC : 3766



\$~76

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 6590/2024 & CM APPL. 27408/2024, CM APPL. 27409/2024

REYANSH THROUGH HIS FATHER SUBHASH CHAND MEENA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arkaneil Bhaumik, Dr Amit George, Mr. Adhishwar Suri, Mr. Rayadurgam Bharat, Mr. Piyo Harold Jaimon, Ms. Supama Jain and Mr. Shashwat Kabi, Advs.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION & ANR Respondents
Through: Ms. Mehak Nakra, ASC for R-1

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

08.05.2024

%

1. The prayer clause in this petition is for a direction to the respondents to admit and enrol the petitioner in the Respondent 2 school in Class II as a student belonging to the Disadvantaged Group (DG) for the academic year 2024-25. The prayer is predicated on the outcome of a computerised draw of lots conducted by the DoE consequent on the petitioner applying, to the DoE, for being granted admission in Class I in the academic year 2023-24 as a DG category student.

2. The draw of lots found the petitioner eligible and entitled for

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AHT
KUMAR WP(C) 6590/2024
Signing Date: 09.05.2024
14:25:56

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 09.05.2024
14:23:04



2024 : DHC : 3766



admission to Respondent 2 school in Class I. As the Respondent 2 school did not admit the petitioner, the present writ petition has been preferred.

3. The issue in controversy stands covered by the judgment of this Court in *Jiya v. Maharaja Agrasen Model School¹*, *Ayesha Sankhla through Guardian Kapil Kumar Sankhala v. Government of N.C.T. of Delhi²* and *Divyan Singh through his father Ajeet Singh v. Directorate of Education³*.

4. This Court has taken a conscious view that cause of action for a direction to the school to appoint the petitioner on the basis of the outcome of computerised draw of lots conducted by the DoE survives only during the currency of the academic year in respect of which the draw of lots was conducted.

5. In the present case, the petitioner applied for admission to Clause II as a DG category student in the academic year 2023-24.

6. The computerised draw of lots was also conducted on that basis, and the petitioner was found entitled for admission to Class I in the respondent school in the academic year 2023-24.

7. That academic year is over. The right for admission, predicated on the draw of lots, can no longer be said to survive.

¹ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 2126

² 2024 SCC OnLine Del 3020



2024 : DHC : 3766



8. As a result, the court regrets that it is not in a position to come to the aid of the petitioner.
9. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.
10. Mr. Bhaumik submits that the petitioner also belongs to the EWS category. If that be so, this order would not preclude the petitioner from applying as an EWS student for admission to Class II for the academic year 2024-25.
11. Any such application, if made, would be processed and proceeded with by the DoE in accordance with the procedure prescribed in that regard.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

MAY 8, 2024

dsn

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)