



\$~62

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 1984/2021 & CM APPL. 5790/2021**
GAUTAM KUMARPetitioner

Through: Mr Anurag Ojha with Mr Vipul
Kumar, Advs.

versus

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MASS COMMUNICATION ..Respondent

Through: Adv Shivam Dwivedi
Dr. Monika Arora (CGSC), Mr. Subhrdeep
Saha (Adv.), Mr. Prabhat Kumar (Adv.), Ms.
Anamika Thakur (Adv.), Mr. Abhinav
Verma(Adv.)
Mr. Neeraj (SPC) Mr. Soumyadip Chakraborty,
Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

30.03.2026

%

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:-

“a. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorarified mandamus thereby quashing the impugned notice dated 28.07.2020/13.06.2020 (Annexure No. P-1) along with policy for 10 % annual fee hike and further mandamus commanding the Respondents to examine the matter of course fee structure again, in a transparent manner with proper representation from each and every stakeholders...”

2. Mr. Ojha, learned counsel for the petitioner, states that the petitioner is challenging the arbitrary and illegal fees charged by the respondent Institute. He states that there is no justification or basis for the respondent Institute to charge the 10% annual fee hike.



3. It is also stated that the impugned notices dated 28.07.2020 and 13.06.2020 of the petitioner are illegal, malafide, arbitrary and consequently, need to be set aside.
4. Mr. Saha, learned counsel for the respondent, has drawn my attention to the counter affidavit filed by the respondent Institute and more particularly paragraph No. 7 of the same, which reads as under:-

7. That in reply to Paras 1 to 6 of the Writ Petition it is stated that the petitioners are students of Academic year 2019-20 and they had taken admission based on the fee structure indicated in the Prospectus issued to them. No change was effected in the fee structure as indicated in the Prospectus. Therefore, the petitioners should not have any grudge for the fee structure since they were aware of it while taking admission. As such, there is no illegality in the Institute's Circulars dated 13.06.2020 and 28.07.2020 through which the petitioners and other students were advised to deposit 2nd/Final Semester fees. It is worth-while to mention that fees of this Institute is comparable to the fees charged by some public funded institutes like FTII, Pune, IIT, Delhi, NID, Ahmedabad, NIFT, Delhi, etc. and further, this Institute's fee are lesser than those charged by private institutions like Amity, Apeejay, Manipal Academy, Xavier and Symbiosis which are in the range of Rs. 3.0 to 6.0 lakh per year. It may also be mentioned that as per demands of the students of this Institute, the Executive Council of this Institute decided to place the matter before a duly constituted Committee. Accordingly, it





was considered by the said Committee which recommended that there should be no change of fee structure since it was as per details prescribed in the Prospectus for the year 2019-20. The recommendations of the Committee were subsequently accepted by the Executive Council in its 143rd meeting held on 19.05.2020.

5. A perusal of the aforesaid paragraph No. 7 shows that the petitioners are students of the academic year 2019-2020 and were fully aware of the fee structure before they took admission.
6. During the entire period of their academic education i.e. one year, there was no change in the fee structure of the respondent Institute.
7. Hence, I am in agreement with the stance of the respondent that the petitioner, being fully aware of the concerned fee structure and having taken admission, cannot subsequently challenge the same. Additionally, the circulars dated 28.07.2020 and 13.06.2020 have also undergone judicial scrutiny in W.P.(C) 15009/2021, wherein a Coordinate Bench of this Court held as under:-

“4. From a perusal of the above-noted averments, it is apparent that fees of the course was notified to the public by Respondent-Institute vide its prospectus and was not increased thereafter. Petitioner enrolled in the course being fully aware of applicable fees and thus, he cannot refuse to pay the same. In absence of any other ground, the Court finds no basis to conclude that the fee is 'excessive' and set aside the impugned notice dated 13th June, 2020. Thus,



entire petition is misconceived and cannot be entertained.”

8. In this view of the matter, I am not inclined to entertain the present petition.
9. In case the petitioner's degree / mark sheet/ certificate has not been released due to non-payment of fees, the petitioner shall visit the office of the respondent Institute, pay the requisite fees (respondent shall not charge any interest) and the relevant degree / mark sheet/ certificate shall be released accordingly.
10. The petition is dismissed in the aforesaid terms.

JASMEET SINGH, J

MARCH 30, 2026 / (MS)