



\$~67

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 6017/2026**

MASTER ADHIRAJ SINGH JAMWAL THROUGH HIS MOTHER
MRS POOJA KAPOORPetitioner

Through: Ms. Ekta Bhasin, Adv.; Mr. R
Sudhinder, Adv.; Ms. Aastha Trivedi, Adv.; Mr.
Sanidhya Sonthalia, Adv.; Mr. Anand Amit, Adv.
versus

DELHI PUBLIC SCHOOL, MATHURA ROAD & ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Mittal, Sr. Adv. (Appearance not
given) for R1

Mr. Premtosh K Mishra (CGSC), Mr. Arpit
Bamal, Mr. Anubhav Upadhyay, Mr. Shrey
Sharma, Advs. for UOI/R2-3

Mr Dhruv Rohatgi Panel Counsel GNCTD Ms
Chandrika Sachdeva Mr Dhruv Kumar, Advs. for
R4-5

Mr Santosh Kumar Rout SC for R6

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

% **04.05.2026**

1. This is a writ petition filed 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 directing Respondents No. 1 to 5 to consider and decide, in a time-bound and reasoned manner, the representation dated 10.04.2026 submitted by the Petitioner’s mother/guardian, in accordance with the RPwD Act, constitutional guarantees, and disability-related policies;



- b. Issue a writ of Mandamus directing Respondent No. 1 (DPS Mathura Road) under supervision of Respondents No. 2 to 3, to provide the Petitioner with full reasonable accommodations in examinations, including but not limited to a writer/scribe and extra time, in view of his disability and PwD enrolment status;*
- c. Issue appropriate writ(s), order(s) or direction(s) quashing and/or setting aside the decision of Respondent No. 1 to detain the Petitioner in Class XI, and direct that he be (a) either promoted to Class XII with appropriate academic support, subject modifications if necessary, and continued provision of disability accommodations, or (b) in the alternative, be given a fresh opportunity of re-examination in the failed subjects with full implementation of writer/scribe, extra time and other disability appropriate support, and his promotion be reconsidered on that basis;*
- d. Issue directions to Respondents No. 2 to 3 to frame and/or enforce appropriate guidelines and monitoring mechanisms to ensure that schools within their jurisdiction, including DPS Mathura Road, comply with disability-related obligations regarding reasonable accommodations, exam modifications, and non-discriminatory evaluation and promotion of students with disabilities, as highlighted in the representation. . . .”*
2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner is a minor, through his mother and natural guardian, and is a student of Delhi Public School, Mathura Road (respondent No.1) and has been detained in Class XI.
3. It is stated that the petitioner suffers from Thalassemia Major (which is



a specified disability under Section 2(zc) of the RPwD Act, 2016) from birth which is a life threatening genetic blood disorder requiring lifelong medical care including periodic blood transfusions.

4. The petitioner informed the respondent regarding his disorder and despite the petitioner informing, a scribe was not provided for Class XI exams, as a result, the petitioner failed in the subjects of Political Science and Legal Studies in his Class XI papers.
5. Hence, the present petition.
6. For the said reasons, issue notice.
7. Mr. Mishra, learned CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the respondent Nos. 2 and 3. Ms. Sachdeva, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent Nos. 4 and 5. Mr. Rout, standing counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent No. 6.
8. Mr. Mittal, learned senior counsel appearing for the respondent No.1, states that the petitioner informed the respondent belatedly and did not ask for a scribe and hence, the confusion. The same is disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioner.
9. However, the respondent No. 1 is conscious of its obligations and in order to comply with the requisite compliance of the of the RPwD Act, 2016, the respondent No.1 shall conduct a re-examination for the petitioner along with a scribe (as per applicable rules) within 4 weeks from today.
10. Taking the statement of the learned senior counsel for the respondent No.1 (on instructions) on record and binding the respondent No.1 to the same, the present petition is disposed of.
11. Ms. Sachdeva, learned counsel for the respondent Nos. 4 and 5 has no



objection to the order passed today. Similarly, Mr. Rout, learned counsel for the respondent No. 6 has no objection to the order passed today.

12. The present petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

MAY 4, 2026 / (MS)

JASMEET SINGH, J