



\$~36

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

+ LPA 736/2025, CM APPL. 76385/2025 & CM APPL. 76386/2025

VANSH AGGARWAL

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Siddhant Soti, Advocate

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI THROUGH
VICE CHANCELLOR/DEAN & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra and Ms. Triptha Sharma, Advocates for R-1.

Mr. Preet Pal Singh, Ms. Tanupreet Kaur and Ms. Medha Navami, Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER

%

04.12.2025

1. Present Letters Patent Appeal has been filed challenging the interim order dated 28.11.2025, passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.(C)18051/2025 titled "*Vansh Aggarwal vs. University of Delhi Through Vice Chancellor/Dean & Anr.*", wherein the learned Single Judge denied the appellant permission to appear in the examination on account of shortage of attendance.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant states that while on one hand, learned Single Judge has allowed similarly situated students to sit for the III semester examinations, insofar as the present appellant is concerned, such interim prayer has been refused. He states that since there is no dispute in respect of the similar situation in which the present appellant and those who have been allowed to sit for the examination, on the grounds of parity,



the appellant may be permitted to sit for the III semester examination commencing tomorrow i.e., 05.12.2025. He also relies upon the interim order passed in the writ petition filed by similarly situated students.

3. We have heard the learned counsel for the appellant and perused the impugned order.

4. For the purpose of considering interim relief, we find it apposite to reproduce herein the relevant paragraphs of the impugned interim order. The same are under:-

“8. Mr. Rupal vehemently opposes the application and submits that Petitioner has not attended a single class in the III Semester and till the filing of this writ petition, no grievance was ever raised that Petitioner was wrongly prevented from attending classes. Petitioner was short of attendance in the II Semester and was rightly detained from attending classes for the next semester. The prayer for allocation of sections and permitting the Petitioner to attend classes at this stage is highly belated and cannot be entertained considering that classes are over and cut-off date for filling examination forms is over.

9. I find prima facie merit in the contention of Mr. Rupal. Admittedly, Petitioner was detained in II Semester owing to shortage of attendance. As per the narrative in the writ petition itself, academic calendar for III Semester was released on 04.07.2025 and classes were to commence from 01.08.2025. Indisputably, Petitioner has not attended a single class of III Semester till date and has filed this writ petition when the classes as also cut-off date for filling the examination form are over. At this stage, Petitioner cannot be permitted to appear in examination of III Semester on the ground that no student can be detained for shortage of attendance, when not a single class was attended in the III Semester and Petitioner has woken up when the III Semester is over. Even otherwise, one wonders how a law student would clear an examination without attending a single class for any subject in the curriculum!”

5. On a query by this Court, learned counsel could not offer any explanation as to why the appellant did not attend the classes of III semester. All that is stated by the counsel for the appellant was that the respondent no.1/university authorities had promised that the inquiry committee would give its report and thereafter the respondent no.1/university would consider



permitting them to attend classes. It would be pertinent to note that the detention order was passed on 24.05.2025, and the enquiry committee report dated 19.09.2025 filed by the respondent no.1/university before this Court. Yet, the appellant did not approach any Court of law for redressal of his grievances. Having not taken timely steps to redress his grievances and remaining a fence sitter, the appellant cannot be permitted to seek parity, particularly, in view of the fact that he has not attended even a single class.

6. It is pertinent to note, and is undisputed that the cut-off date for filing the examination forms is over and no relief can be granted at such a belated stage.

7. We may also note that permitting a student to sit for examinations who has not attended even a single class, would not augur well in the public perception. In fact, it may be discouraging to all those sincere students who not only attended their classes but also ensured that they are not short of attendance. Permitting such students would also be a premium to clear indiscipline and insincerity. The appellant being a student of law, ought to have been more sincere in attending classes and its unfathomable as to how the student who has not attended even a single class would be able to sit for the examination.

8. In that view of the matter, we are not inclined to interfere in the order passed by learned Single Judge and accordingly the instant appeal is dismissed alongwith pending applications, if any.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

DECEMBER 04, 2025/rl