



\$~31

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ W.P.(C) 17079/2024, CM APPL. 72439/2024, CM APPL.  
76429/2024

SHIVANGI KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anuj P. Agarwala, Mr. Kunj  
Mehra, Advs.

versus

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Mrinal Gopal Elker, Ms. Chhavi  
Khandelwal, Mr. Chinmoy Chaitanya,  
Advs. for R-1.

Mr. Om Prakash, SPC, Mr. Nitish  
Pande, Mr. Amish Kumar, Mr.  
Sarthak Udaipuria, Mr. Chandresh  
Pratap, Ms. Swati Mishra, Advs. for  
R-2/UGC.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR SHARMA**

**ORDER**

**07.01.2025**

%

1. Briefly stated the facts of the present case are that the petitioner initially enrolled in the Master in Public Policy (M.P.P.) Programme ('Programme A') which is a two-year full-time course. While studying in the second year of the said Programme A, the petitioner simultaneously took admission in the Master of Technology in Transportation Engineering ('Programme B'), which commenced in July 2023. After completing the first year of Programme B, the petitioner enrolled in the Master of Technology in



Construction Engineering and Management ('Programme C'), which started in July 2024. Subsequently, IIT Delhi cancelled the petitioner's admissions to Programmes B and C. However, upon the petitioner's representation, IIT Delhi awarded her a degree in Programme A (Master in Public Policy) and issued transcripts for the credits she earned in Programme B (M.Tech. in Transportation Engineering) during the academic session 2023–2024

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that she has already withdrawn from Programme B and may be permitted to continue with Programme C as the same started after the completion of Programme A and, therefore, no rules were violated.
3. Learned counsel for IIT submits that this is not permissible, as the petitioner's admission to Programme C was cancelled in September 2024, and she did not appear for the major examinations held in November 2024. It is further submitted that the petitioner violated the applicable rules and conditions of the university.
4. After hearing both the parties at some length the Court considers that this Court should be very slow in interfering with the administration of IIT Delhi which is a premier institute of this Country, except in the exceptional circumstances. It is a settled principle in law that Educational Institutions should be allowed to retain their autonomy and expertise in managing academic and disciplinary matters, with judicial intervention limited to exceptional circumstances involving the interpretation of a statutory provision or law. Reliance can be placed on ***Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Education v. Paritosh Bhumpeshkumar Sheth*** (1984) 4 SCC 27 wherein the Apex



Court *inter alia* held as under:

*"29. ... The court should be extremely reluctant to substitute its own views as to what is wise, prudence and proper in relation to academic matters in preference to those formulated by professional men possessing technical expertise and rich experience of actual day-to-day working of education institutions and departments controlling them."*

5. Similarly, in the case of ***All India Counsel for Technical Education v. Sudden Kumar Dhawan & Ors.*** (2009) 11 SCC 726 it was *inter alia* held that that the roles of statutory expert bodies on education and the courts are distinctly delineated by a simple principle. When it concerns matters of educational policy or academic issues, courts generally refrain from interference. However, if a provision or principle of law needs to be interpreted, applied, or enforced in connection with education, the courts will step in. While there is no absolute prohibition, it is a rule of prudence that courts should exercise caution and avoid unsettling decisions made by academic bodies.
6. In the present case, the petitioner has an ambition of acquiring more and more education. However, in her ambition, it seems that some guidelines/rules are coming into the way.
7. Let the present writ petition be treated as a representation and be placed before the Director, IIT Delhi. Ld. Director is requested to constitute a committee comprising three senior professors to examine the representation. The committee is requested to consider the matter having due regard to the principle that the welfare of the



candidate/student is of paramount importance.

8. Keeping in view the exigency, the Director of IIT Delhi is requested to ensure that the committee provides its findings within two weeks. In case, the petitioner remains aggrieved, she will be at liberty to approach the Court through an appropriate legal remedy.
9. In light of the above, the present petition, along with any pending application, stands disposed of.

**DINESH KUMAR SHARMA, J**

**JANUARY 7, 2025/AR/SMG..**