



\$~67

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 597/2025**

HARSHWATI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.K. Saini, Adv.

versus

PROF DR GIRIJA SHANKAR BAJPAI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha, Standing
Counsel with Mr. Siddhartha
Goswami, Adv. along with Mr. Vijay
Prakash Pandey, Assistant Registrar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

%

22.04.2025

CM APPL. 23258/2025 (Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed subject to just exception.
2. Application stands disposed of, accordingly.

CONT.CAS(C) 597/2025

1. Mr. R.K. Saini, Counsel for the petitioner, points out to the order dated 22nd October 2024, where the following directions were passed:



3. Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the Respondents on advance copy of the writ petition, on instructions, states that the grievances ventilated by the Petitioner in the present petition will be placed before the Executive Council of National Law University, Delhi in the next meeting as and when the same is convened.
4. Accordingly, without entering into merits of the case and on the assurance given by learned Standing Counsel for the Respondents, on instructions, this writ petition, at this stage, is disposed of with a direction that the grievances of the Petitioner flagged in the present petition shall be placed for re-consideration before the Executive Council of National Law University, Delhi in the next meeting, as and when the same is convened. The decision taken by the Executive Council shall be communicated to the Petitioner within one week of the decision and Petitioner will be at liberty to take recourse to legal remedies, in case of any surviving grievance and if so advised.
2. Counsel for the respondent states that the compliance of the same has been done and the representation has been decided in the Executive Council meeting held on 19th February 2025, extract from which, has been presented through a communication dated 20th February 2025.
3. The said communication has not been provided to the counsel for the petitioner, or the petitioner, who is completely unaware of what had transpired on 19th February 2025.
4. At the least, the respondent was expected to do was to communicate to the petitioner, or the counsel for the petitioner, compliance of the orders of this Court.
5. The omission by the University in this regard is not called for and not



expected.

6. In any event, considering the decision has been taken, it is up to the petitioner to pursue its remedies in accordance with law.

7. The petition is disposed of with liberty given to the petitioner to pursue its remedies in accordance with law.

8. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

APRIL 22, 2025/MK/kp