



\$~177

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

+ **W.P.(C) 18188/2025**

RUDRA NANDAN TIWARI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Chetan Tripathi, Advocate.

versus

GGSIPIU AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Anita Sahani, Advocate for R-1.

Mr. Vikas Chopra, Standing Counsel for MCD

with Mr. Neeraj Kumar, Ms. Khushi and Ms. Anita R. Mishra, Advocates for R-2.

Mr. Balendu Shekhar, CGSC with Mr. Rajkumar Maurya, Mr. Krishna Chaitanya and Mr. Divyansh Singh Dev, Advocates for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

% **03.12.2025**

CM APPL. 75235/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 18188/2025 & CM APPL. 75236/2025

3. This writ petition is filed by the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs:-

“A. Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ/ order or direction for granting extension of time prescribed in the impugned notification no. 389 of 2025 dated 19.11.2025 bearing No. F.NO. IPU 7/DI(Academic)/Counselling/ 2025/1671 issued by Respondent No.1 for payment of fees and reporting to the medical college allotted to the petitioner; and/or,



B. Direct Respondent No.1 to secure the seat allotted to the Petitioner till the time period required to obtain the documents from the present college of the Petitioner that Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper; and/or,

C. Pass any other or further order(s) that this Hon'ble court may deem fit and proper in the present facts and circumstances of the case."

4. To the extent necessary, case of the Petitioner as set forth in the writ petition is that NEET 2025 was conducted by National Testing Agency ('NTA') on 04.05.2025 for admissions to undergraduate medical education seats including MBBS in various medical institutions. On conclusion of the counselling rounds 01, 02 and 03, Respondent No. 1 issued a notification dated 11.11.2025 for conducting Stray Vacancy Round starting from 11.11.2025 and ending on 13.11.2025 through centralized online counselling for MBBS programme for academic session 2025-2026.

5. It is stated that on 14.11.2025, Respondent No.1 issued another notification informing all stakeholders that on account of non-declaration of result of Stray Round till date by Respondent No. 3, Respondent No. 1 was extending the schedule of registration and choice filling till 12:00 noon of 17.11.2025. The notification provided that detailed procedure to be followed after declaration of result of Stray Round shall be notified on or after 17.11.2025.

6. It is stated that in the afternoon of 20.11.2025, Petitioner came to know that Respondent No.1 had issued another notification on 19.11.2025 and candidates with allotment of seats in Stray Round were directed to pay part of academic fee till 12:00 noon of 20.11.2025 and report to allotted institute before 06:00 PM on 20.11.2025. On checking the result of the Stray Round published on the website of Respondent No.1, Petitioner found himself selected for MBBS programme in North Delhi Municipal



Corporation Medical College & Hindu Rao Hospital under Home State Quota.

7. It is stated that on 20.11.2025 Petitioner was in Jhansi, Uttar Pradesh where he is undergoing an undergraduate course and tried to deposit the fees through net banking, however, he was unable to do so due to connectivity problem in Jhansi. Despite best efforts to travel by train and reach Delhi, Petitioner could not make it till 06:00 PM on 20.11.2025 to join the allotted college. Petitioner made efforts on 21.11.2025 to meet the concerned officers at the allotted college but was unsuccessful since the college expressed its helplessness in the matter and compelled by the circumstances Petitioner has approached this Court.

8. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner succeeded in the Stray Round of Counselling and it was not his fault that the notification gave a narrow window of few hours to deposit the fee and join the allotted college. Petitioner made his best effort to pay the fees online but the connectivity issue in Jhansi prevented him from paying the fees. The distance between Jhansi to Delhi is approximately 500 km and even though, Petitioner boarded the train as soon as he could, he was not able to reach the allotted college by 06:00 PM. In these facts, Petitioner seeks to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court to direct the Respondents to permit him to pay the fees and join the course at Respondent No.2/College.

9. Learned counsels for the Respondents jointly submit that it is not permissible to extend the cut-off dates prescribed in the notification dated 19.11.2025 as this is against the settled law. Moreover, extending the date in one case would lead to several requests from other candidates who may have found themselves in a similar situation. It is also urged that it is not the



domain of the Courts to interfere in cut-off dates and pass directions to alter or extend them.

10. Having heard learned counsels for the parties, I am of the view that the relief sought by the Petitioner cannot be granted by this Court. Even though the Court sympathizes with the Petitioner, no direction can be issued permitting the Petitioner to join the allocated college at this stage. It is trite that prescribing cut-off dates and/or eligibility conditions for admissions or selections is the domain of the executive. No doubt, when cut-off dates are prescribed, many candidates will fall on the wrong side but this cannot be sufficient reason to direct alteration or extension of cut-off dates. In ***Shikhar and Another v. National Board of Examination and Others, (2024) 15 SCC 725***, the Supreme Court held that that it is domain of the executive and regulatory authorities to formulate appropriate eligibility standards for admissions. In ***Indian Institute of Technology and Others v. Soutrik Sarangi and Others, (2021) 17 SCC 79***, the Supreme Court has held that Court should be circumspect in exercising powers of judicial review in matters concerning academic policies including admission criteria, etc. The Supreme Court in ***Hirandra Kumar v. High Court of Judicature at Allahabad and Another, (2020) 17 SCC 401***, held that power to fix cut-off date or age-limit is incidental to regulatory control which authority exercises over selection process. A certain degree of arbitrariness may appear on the face of any cut-off date which is prescribed since candidates on the wrong side of line may stand excluded as consequence but that is no reason to hold that the cut-off date is arbitrary.

11. In light of the aforesaid judgments, this Court is unable to come to the aid of the Petitioner as accepting his plea would amount to extending the



cut-off date prescribed in the notification dated 19.11.2025, which is impermissible in law. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed along with pending application.

JYOTI SINGH, J

DECEMBER 3, 2025/RW