



\$~47

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10106/2024**

ANUSHKA SINDHWANI

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Shubham Jha, Advocate**

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: **Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal and Mr. Hardik Rupal, Advocates for University of Delhi/R-1**
Ms. Anubha Bhardwaj SPP for CBI with Mr. Vishal Sharma and Ms. Aadrita Rawat, Advocates for R-2/ CBI

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

24.07.2024

CM APPL. 41390/2024 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 10106/2024

3. The present writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed by the petitioner seeking declaration of the seat matrix of College of Arts i.e. respondent no. 2, wherein total number of seats in the courses have been reduced and seats reserved for 'People with Disabilities' (PWD) students have been removed, as *void*; and for directing the respondent(s) to restore and maintain the original number of seats allocated



to PWD students in College of Arts, in Post Graduation in painting.

4. Learned counsel, who appears on behalf of the petitioner, submits that petitioner is a student suffering from a disability, which is supported by the Certificate of Disability annexed with the petition. It is stated that the petitioner has graduated from respondent no. 2 college in Painting course, under the PWD category. It is further submitted that in December, 2023, she had filled up the CUET-PG form, for seeking admission in Painting PG Programme in College of Arts, under PWD category. However, to the utter shock of the petitioner, the prospectus issued by the College of Arts reflected, in the seat matrix, that there were no seats reserved under the PWD category for Painting-PG programme. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the act of respondent no.2, of decreasing the seats reserved for PWD category, will leave the representation of this category to zero per cent, which will be contrary to Articles 14, 15, 21 & 29 of the Constitution of India.

5. In the meantime, learned counsel for the petitioner also states that he has already made various representations to the Principal of respondent no. 2 as well as respondent no. 1 i.e. University of Delhi, however, no action has been taken on his representations.

6. Considering the above-noted facts and circumstances, it is directed that the present petition be treated as a representation on behalf of the petitioner, in addition to the representation already filed by her. The same shall be decided within a period of two weeks by the respondent no. 2 i.e. College of Arts, Delhi, under intimation to the petitioner.

7. In case, the petitioner will still have any grievance, she will be at liberty to approach this Court.



8. In view of the above, the present petition stands disposed of.
9. Copy of this order be given *dasti* under the signature of Court Master.
10. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

JULY 24, 2024/zp

SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

Click here to check corrigendum, if any