



2025:DHC:8753



\$~104

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% *Judgment Delivered on: 26.09.2025*

+ W.P.(C) 14940/2025

NASHRAH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sher Afgon, Adv.

versus

JAMIA MILLIA ISLAMIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Pritish Sabharwal, Standing
Counsel with Mr. Shiv Chopra, Mr.
Sarjeet Kumar and Ms. Shweta Singh,
Advs. for R-1 to 4 (JMI).
Ms. Gayatri Virmani, Adv. for
R-5/Council of Architecture.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN****JUDGMENT****VIKAS MAHAJAN, J (ORAL)**

1. The present petition has been filed seeking following reliefs:

- “i. Issue Writ in the nature of mandamus or other writs, orders or directions directing the respondents no. 1-4 to declare the name of the petitioner as selected candidate for admission in B.Arch. of Jamia Millia Islamia/respondent no. 1 for academic session 2025-2026,
- ii. Direct the respondent no. 5 to ensure that respondent no. 1 is following the rules, regulations, policies and guidelines issued by respondent no. 5 for admission in B.Arch 2025-2026 session on the basis of the NATA Test Score Marks of 2024 & 2025.”

2. The material facts as articulated in the present petition are not in



2025:DHC:8753



dispute. It is the case of petitioner that the petitioner appeared in National Aptitude Test in Architecture (NATA) 2024 and qualified the same by scoring 143 marks.

3. The petitioner did not secure admission in any institution based on her NATA 2024 score. However, to better her score, the petitioner again took NATA 2025 in the category of general candidate for taking admission in B.Arch. 2025-26. She made only one attempt of NATA 2025, as against three attempts available, and scored 86 marks.

4. On the basis of scores obtained by petitioner in NATA 2024, as well as, in NATA 2025, the petitioner registered herself for admission in B.Arch./B.Arch. (Self-Finance) course in respondent no.1/University in the reservation category of 'Muslim Women'.

5. On 19.08.2025, respondent no.4/Controller of Examination (Jamia Millia Islamia) issued first list of candidates provisionally selected for admission in B.Arch./B.Arch. (Self-Finance) on the basis of score of NATA strictly as per the merit, for Academic Session 2025-26.

6. The cut-off marks for B.Arch. in Muslim Women category, was shown as 124 as per the first list. The cut-off marks for B.Arch. (Self-Finance) in Muslim Women category as per the second list of selected candidates was shown as 118.

7. The petitioner was surprised to note that her name was not shown in the said first list of selected candidates for 'Muslim Women' category and accordingly, she immediately made a representation dated 19.08.2025 to respondent no.4/Controller of Examination (JMI).

8. Despite such representation, the name of petitioner was not shown



2025:DHC:8753



even in the second and third list. However, on enquiry being made by petitioner on 10.09.2025, it transpired that the petitioner's score in NATA 2024 has not been considered for admission in B.Arch. for Academic Session 2025-26 by respondent no.1/University whereas the score of NATA 2024 in case of similarly placed candidates was so considered, and they were also granted admission.

9. To buttress his contention, Mr. Sher Afgon, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner invites attention of the Court to score cards of two candidates namely, Mr. Abdullah Ansari and Mr. Nabeel Ahmad, who had secured 136 and 125 marks, respectively in NATA 2024.

10. Notice in the petition was issued by this Court on 25.09.2025 and Mr. Pritish Sabharwal, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent nos.1 to 4/JMI had sought time to seek instructions.

11. Today, Mr. Sabharwal has returned with instructions to the effect that the list of students on the basis of updated result upto 26.07.2025 was sent by NATA to respondent no.1/University *vide* e-mail dated 06.08.2025 and the said list was considered by the University for the purpose of granting admission to the students.

12. He submits that in the said list, the score of the petitioner was mentioned as 86, which was the petitioner's score in NATA 2025, whereas, petitioner's score of NATA 2024 was not so mentioned, and accordingly, the same was not considered. As all the admissions were granted by respondent no.1/University on the basis of said list which was furnished to respondent no.1/University on 06.08.2025 by NATA, the petitioner could not be granted admission.



2025:DHC:8753



13. He contends that as on date, all the seats have been filled for B.Arch. under all the categories, and the last date for freezing seats in respondent no.1/University was 26.07.2025.

14. On the other hand, Ms. Gayatri Virmani, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.5/Council of Architecture, submits that an e-mail dated 13.08.2025 was received from the petitioner by NATA pointing out that she has not been granted admission by respondent no.1/University despite she having scored 143 marks in NATA 2024.

15. She submits that pursuant to the said mail of petitioner, the new score of the petitioner was updated on the portal by NATA on 18.08.2025 and the same was communicated to petitioner *vide* e-mail dated 18.08.2025. Later, the same score was also communicated to the respondent no.1/University by NATA *vide* e-mail dated 29.08.2025.

16. She contends that admissions were still underway when petitioner's score in NATA 2024 was communicated to the respondent no.1/University, inasmuch as the last list was published by respondent no.1/University on 11.09.2025.

17. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, the short question that needs to be decided is as to whether the petitioner was eligible for admission in B.Arch. in the respondent no.1/University for Academic Session 2025-26, and whether the petitioner is at fault in any manner.

18. Indubitably, the information bulletin issued by respondent no.5/Council of Architecture for 'NATA 2025' provides that those candidates who have already appeared in NATA 2024 and availed one, two, or three attempts and obtained a valid NATA 2024 score, may also apply for



2025:DHC:8753



NATA 2025 but their NATA 2024 score shall be frozen if they avail three attempts in NATA 2025. It is further provided that their NATA 2025 score shall be calculated/determined in the following manner, depending upon number of attempts:

<i>Appeared in NATA 2024</i>	<i>Attempts in NATA 2025</i>	<i>Final Score</i>
<i>Obtained a valid 2024 score</i>	<i>1st attempt</i>	<i>Better of both scores of NATA 2024 & 2025</i>
	<i>1st & 2nd Attempt</i>	<i>Best of three scores of NATA 2025</i>
	<i>1st, 2nd, 3rd Attempt</i>	<i>Best of three scores of NATA 2025 (NATA 2024 score shall be rendered invalid)</i>

19. The petitioner had appeared in NATA 2024 and again took one attempt in NATA 2025, therefore, as per the above tabulated chart as provided in the information bulletin of NATA 2025, better of both scores of NATA 2024 and NATA 2025 is to be considered to determine petitioner's eligibility for admission in B.Arch. for the academic session 2025-26.

20. As noted above, the petitioner scored 143 marks in NATA 2024 whereas she scored 86 marks in NATA 2025, therefore, for the purpose of calculating her score and determining her eligibility for admission in B.Arch., respondent no.1/University ought to have taken into account the score of 143.

21. A perusal of merit list, to which attention of the Court has been invited by Mr. Sabharwal, shows that in case of Muslim Women category, the cut-off was 124 marks in the first list, whereas, the petitioner having



2025:DHC:8753



scored 143 marks in NATA 2024 was clearly eligible for admission in B.Arch. 2025-26.

22. The confusion seems to have occurred only on account of lack of proper communication between the respondent no.1/University and the respondent no.5/Council of Architecture (NATA). The NATA maintains that respondent no.1/University was communicated about petitioner's score in NATA 2024 on 29.08.2025 and the same had already been updated on the portal on 18.08.2025, whereas the admissions in the respondent no.1/University continued till 11.09.2025, therefore, the petitioner ought to have been considered for admission.

23. On the other hand, the specific stand taken by respondent no.1/University is that all the admissions were granted by respondent no.1/University on the basis of scores sent by NATA *vide* e-mail dated 06.08.2025 which mentioned the NATA scores as on 26.07.2025. It is further the stand of the University that the seats were frozen as on 26.07.2025.

24. Be that as it may, this Court finds that on the basis of her score obtained in NATA 2024, the petitioner was eligible for admission in B.Arch. for the academic session 2025-26 as per the cut-off list issued by the respondent no.1/University. Rather, two similarly placed students namely, Mr. Abdullah Ansari and Mr. Nabeel Ahmad, who had scored lesser marks than the petitioner in NATA 2024, have already been granted admission on the basis of their score in NATA 2024.

25. In the given circumstances, the petitioner is not at fault in any manner for the non-grant of admission by respondent no.1/University in B.Arch. for



2025:DHC:8753



the academic session 2025-26. The fault or confusion, if any, as noted above, lies elsewhere. The petitioner is a meritorious student, who cannot be made to suffer.

26. Having regard to the two salutary principles of law viz., (i) no one can take advantage of his own wrong, and (ii) no one can be penalized for no fault of his, this Court is of the opinion that the present petition deserves to be allowed. Ordered accordingly.

27. As noted above, the stand taken by Mr. Sabharwal is that, all seats in B.Arch. have been filled and there is no seat available to admit the petitioner. However, in the peculiar facts of the present case, the respondent no.1/University is directed to create a supernumerary seat in B.Arch. course in the category of 'Muslim Women', and the petitioner be granted admission against said seat for the Academic Session 2025-26, within a period of one week from today.

28. The petition alongwith pending application, if any, is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

29. Copy of this order be given *dasti* under signatures of Court Master.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 26, 2025

aj