



\$~19

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ EFA(OS) 17/2025, CM APPL. 66378/2025, CM APPL. 66379/2025, CM APPL. 66380/2025, CM APPL. 66381/2025 and CM APPL. 66643/2025
JAMIA HAMDARD (DEEMED TO BE UNIVERSITY)

.....Appellant

Through: Dr. Amit George, Dr. Swaroop George, Mr. Mobashshir Sarwar, Mr. Abhinandan Jain, Mr. Sunil Roy, Ms. Ibansara Syiemlieh, Mr. Shivam Prajapati, Mr. Abhigyan Dwivedi Mr. Kartikey Puneesh, Mr. Kartikey and Mr. Takrim Ahsan Khan, Advs.

versus

ASAD MUEED & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar Sr. Adv. along with Mr. Saket Sikri, Ms. Ekta Kalra Sikri, Mr. Simran Mehta, Mr. Vikalp Mudgal and Mr. Priyansh Choudhary, Advs. for R-1 & 2.
Mr. Neeraj Malhotra, Sr. Adv. along with Mr. Rajiv Kumar Virmani, Mr. Shubham Pandey and Mr. Nimsh Kumar, Mr. Naimesh Gupta, Advs. for R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR

ORDER

14.11.2025

%

1. The present Appeal has been filed by the Appellant assailing the correctness of the order dated 10.10.2025 [hereinafter referred to as



the ‘Impugned Order’] passed by the learned Single Judge in OMP (ENF) No.6/2025 captioned ***Asad Mueed & Anr. vs. Hammad Ahmed & Ors.***

2. With the consent of learned counsel representing the parties, the issue of maintainability of the present Appeal is kept open.

3. As admitted by Mr. Rajiv Nayar, learned senior counsel and with the consent of the learned counsel representing the remaining parties, the names of Respondent Nos.2 to 5 shall stand deleted from the memo of parties.

4. After arguing at length, learned counsel representing the parties have arrived at a consensus.

5. It has been agreed that the Paragraph No.7 of the Impugned Order passed by the learned Single Judge (Executing Court) shall be substituted with Paragraph No.13 of the order dated 16.09.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in ARB.A.3/2025 & I.A. 20074/2025 captioned ***Jamia Hamdard Deemed to be University vs. Asad Mueed & Ors***, which reads as under:

“13. A reading of the aforesaid paragraphs reveals that the Arbitral Tribunal has given a direction to the respondents in the arbitration and the appellant, to extend support to the claimants and HIMSR in their attempt to secure 150 MBBS seats for the academic year 2025-26. However, the Arbitrator clarifies that the support has to be within the confines of the law. The impugned order further directs that the appellant should not create “purported legal hurdles” so as to deny the 150 MBBS seats to HIMSR for the academic year 2025-26. This would necessarily imply that if the claimants and HIMSR are not acting within the confines of law, the appellant need not support them.”

6. Consequently, Paragraph No.7 of the Impugned Order shall stand deleted and, in its place, Paragraph No.13 of order dated 16.09.2025 shall be incorporated as Paragraph No.7 in the Impugned Order.



7. In view of the above, the present Appeal, along with the pending applications, stands disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.

NOVEMBER 14, 2025

s.godara/pal