



\$~58 to 60

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

+ LPA 622/2025 & CAV 385/2025, CM APPL. 63024/2025

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. R. Venkataramani, Attorney General of India with Mr. Mohinder J S Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Ms. Mayuri Lende, Ms. Yamika Khanna, Mr. Kartikay Aggarwal and Mr. Chitvan Singhal, Advocates

versus

PROF RASAL SINGH & ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Geeta Luthra, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Lakshay Saini, Ms. Prashansika Thakur, Ms. Shalini Singh, Ms. Jayita Verma, Ms. Shriya Singh, Mr. Anuj Singh, Mr. Rishabh Dahiya, Advocates

+ LPA 623/2025 & CM APPL. 63047/2025, CM APPL. 63048/2025

RAMANUJAN COLLEGE

.....Appellant

Through: Ms. Jyoti Taneja, Mr. Shivesh Kotwal, Mr. Shivam Malhotra, Advs. Mr. R. Venkataramani, Attorney General of India with Mr. Mohinder J S Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Ms. Mayuri Lende, Ms. Yamika Khanna, Mr. Kartikay Aggarwal and Mr. Chitvan Singhal, Advocates

versus



PROF RASAL SINGH & ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Geeta Luthra, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Lakshay Saini, Ms. Prashansika
Thakur, Ms. Shalini Singh, Ms. Jayita
Verma, Ms. Shriya Singh, Mr. Anuj
Singh, Mr. Rishabh Dahiya,
Advocates

+ LPA 624/2025 & CM APPL. 63072/2025, CM APPL. 63073/2025

X & ORS

.....Appellants

Through: Mr. Nikhil Goel, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Sahil Raveen, Mr. Riddhi Jain,
Mr. Adithya Koshi, Advocates
Mr. R. Venkataramani, Attorney
General of India with Mr. Mohinder J
S Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms.
Aishwarya Malhotra, Ms. Mayuri
Lende, Ms. Yamika Khanna, Mr.
Kartikay Aggarwal and Mr. Chitvan
Singhal, Advocates

versus

PROF RASAL SINGH & ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Geeta Luthra, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Lakshay Saini, Ms. Prashansika
Thakur, Ms. Shalini Singh, Ms. Jayita
Verma, Ms. Shriya Singh, Mr. Anuj
Singh, Mr. Rishabh Dahiya,
Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIMAL KUMAR YADAV

ORDER

15.10.2025

%



1. On 09.10.2025, this Court while fixing the case to be heard on 14.10.2025, had noted the submission made by Respondent No.1/Principal, who was present in Court, that he would not go to the College till 14.10.2025.
2. This Court heard the matter in detail and had posted the case for today, i.e., 15.10.2025, for pronouncement of the judgment. The judgment has been prepared. However, prior to the pronouncement of the judgment, Ms. Geeta Luthra, learned Senior Counsel for Respondent No.1, on instructions from the Respondent No.1, who is present in Court today, states that the Respondent No.1/Principal would continue to be on leave till the disposal of the writ petition by the learned Single Judge.
3. Keeping in mind the object of the POSH Act which is to expeditiously decide a complaint under the Act, the prayer made by the learned Senior Counsel for Respondent No.1/Principal, is a fair and reasonable one.
4. The issues involved in this case are regarding the power of a University/College to suspend a Principal in a case under the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013, (*hereinafter referred to as the 'POSH Act'*) and the power of the University/College to constitute an *ad hoc* fact finding committee pursuant to receiving a complaint under the POSH Act which are purely questions of law. Accordingly, the learned Single Judge is requested to expeditiously decide the said issues so that a final and authoritative pronouncement is made by the Court on these aspects and the College can function smoothly thereafter. This would also pave the way for the appropriate committee under the POSH Act to proceed further with the enquiry into the complaints.



5. Without expressing anything on merits and considering that the observations made by the learned Single Judge are only *prima facie* in nature which will be finally adjudicated after hearing all the parties in detail, the present appeals are disposed of, with a request to the learned Single Judge to dispose of the writ petition as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of three months from today.

6. Needless to state that this concession given by the learned Senior Counsel for the Respondent No.1/Principal is without prejudice to the rights and contentions of Respondent No.1 on the merits of the case.

7. It is also made clear that none of the parties, i.e., the University, the College and the Complainants, will take any step which will have the effect of prejudicing the enquiry. They are directed not to circulate any message, hold press conference or any meeting in this regard.

8. With these observations, the appeals are disposed of along with pending application(s), if any.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

VIMAL KUMAR YADAV, J

OCTOBER 15, 2025

hsk