



\$~101

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

+ **W.P.(C) 19682/2025**

JOSHI ANKIT

....Petitioner

Through: Ms Gargi Srivastava, Adv.

versus

NATIONAL MEDICAL COMMISSION & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. T Singhdev, Mr. Abhijit

Chakravarty, Mr. Vedant Sood, Adv. for R1

Ms. Saroj Bidawat, Adv. for R2

Mr. Sihag, Adv. for R3-5

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

%

16.01.2026

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

“a) Pass appropriate writ, order or direction(s) quashing Clause 5.4 of the ‘Manual for DNB Broad Speciality Trainees, 2022’ and Clause 4.7, ‘DNB-PDCET Information Bulletin, 2025’ issued by Respondent No.2 herein as being arbitrary, discriminatory and violative of the fundamental rights of the Petitioner under Article 14 Constitution of India;

b) Pass appropriate writ, order or direction(s) directing the Respondents to allow the Petitioner to participate in Round 3/ subsequent rounds of NEET PG counselling 2025 for DNB seats also;

c) Pass appropriate writ, order or direction(s) directing the Respondents to allot the Petitioner a DNB- General Medicine



seat in the following academic session commencing pursuant to the counselling process underway as per the Petitioner's rank and merit in NEET-PG results declared on 19.08.2025; d) Pass appropriate writ, order or direction(s) directing the Respondents to keep one (1) DNB- General Medicine seat vacant for the Petitioner till the final disposal of the present petition;"

2. Ms. Srivastava, learned counsel for the petitioner, states that the petitioner is not being permitted to participate in the counselling for Diplome of the National Board ("**DNB**") seats.
3. Ms. Bidawat, learned counsel for the respondent No.2, states that there is no provision under the NEET PG 2025 Information Bulletin for debarring a candidate from joining another DNB seat.
4. She further states that as far as counselling is concerned, it is the MCC, which is respondent No. 3 is the concerned authority.
5. Mr. Sihag, learned counsel for the respondent Nos. 3,4, and 5, disputes the same and states that in terms of Chapter 7 of the NEET PG MD/MS DNB Counselling 2025 as far as the allotment of seat and Counselling is concerned, it is the respondent No. 2 who is the concerned authority.
6. In view of the statement made by Ms. Bidawat, on instructions, and binding the respondents to the same, the petition is disposed of.
7. In case the petitioner has any other difficulty, the petitioner will be at liberty to revive the petition.

JASMEET SINGH, J

JANUARY 16, 2026/AS