



\$~49

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

+ **LPA 140/2025**

REHABILITATION COUNCIL OF INDIAAppellant

Through: **Mr. Siddhartha Shankar Ray, CGSC**
with **Mr. Suryadeep Singh, Advocate**

versus

DELHI COLLEGE OF SPECIAL EDUCATIONRespondent

Through: **Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Sr. Advocate**
with **Mr. Ayush Anand and Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocates**

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER

% **25.02.2025**

CM APPL. 11326/2025 (for delay of 235 days)

1. Having regard to the averments made in the application seeking condonation of delay, the application is allowed and delay of 235 days in filing the instant Letters Patent Appeal is condoned.

2. The application is disposed of.

LPA 140/2025 & CM APPL. 11327/2025 CM APPL. 11328/2025

3. Heard learned counsel representing the parties.

4. This appeal preferred under Clause X of the Letters Patent challenges the judgment dated 31.05.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.(C)5398/2024.

5. In the writ petition, under challenge were the Circulars dated 04.01.2024 and 08.03.2024, conveying the decision of the appellant-council



to return the applications/proposals submitted by the respondents for starting new courses in special education.

6. Learned Single Judge while allowing the writ petition quashed the aforesaid circulars dated 04.01.2024 and 08.03.2024 and set aside the same to the extent that the same returned the applications/proposals made by the respondents. Learned Single Judge further directed that the applications/proposals submitted by the respondents be processed afresh in accordance with law.

7. We have been informed that pursuant to the order passed by the learned Single Judge, which is impugned in this appeal, the proposals submitted by the respondents have been processed by the appellant-council and the same have been rejected, exception to which has been taken by the respondent before the appropriate forum.

8. In view of the aforesaid, we are of the opinion that no fruitful purpose would be served in carrying on the proceedings of the appeal, which is hereby dismissed.

9. However, we make it clear that questions of law raised in the appeal are kept open to be considered in some appropriate case.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

FEBRUARY 25, 2025

j