



\$~61

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010409462024
+ **W.P.(C) 9643/2024 & CM APPL. 23421/2026**
ADITYA SINGH & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr Satyanarain, Mr. Arun Renu,
Advs.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Adv Mohinder Rupal Adv Hardik
Rupal Adv Aishwarya Malhotra Adv Tripta
Sharma for R1
Mr Dhruv Rohatgi PC GNCTD Ms Chandrika
Sachdeva Mr Dhruv Kumars, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER
13.08.2026

%

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

“i. Pass a writ/order/instruction/direction in the nature of prohibition thereby prohibiting the respondents from conducting the second semester examination of LL.M. three years course i.e. 2023-2026 without compliance of the mandate of 90 hours classes of each subject.

ii. Pass a writ/order/instruction/direction in the nature of Certiorari thereby quashing the detention list dated 03.07.2024.



iii. Pass a writ/order/direction in the nature of mandamus in favour of the petitioners and against the respondents thereby directing the respondents jointly and severally to delete the name of the petitioners from the detained list dated 03.07.2024 thereby depriving the petitioners from appearing in second Semester examination of LL.M. three years course, Academic year 2023-2026.

iv. Pass a writ/order/direction in the nature of mandamus in favour of the petitioners and against the respondents thereby directing the respondents jointly and severally to allow the petitioners to appear in second Semester examination of LL.M. three years course, Academic year which are due

v. Pass a writ/order/direction in the nature of mandamus in favour of the petitioners and against the respondents thereby directing the respondents jointly and severally to hold re-examination/ supplementary examination for the petitioners to appear in second Semester examination of LL.M. three years course for the subjects which have been conducted and the petitioners were not allowed to sit due to their detained status.

vi. Pass a writ/order/direction in the nature of mandamus in favour of the petitioners and against the respondents thereby directing the respondents jointly and severally to issue the fresh admit cards.



vii. Pass a writ/order/direction in the nature of prohibition in favour of the petitioners and against the respondents thereby prohibiting the respondents jointly and severally and their officials from creating any hurdles and obstruction on the way of the petitioner to appear in their examination scheduled for the due papers.....”

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner No.1 is a student of LL.M. three-year course at the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi admitted in the year 2023. He was not permitted to appear in the second semester LL.M. exam due to shortage of attendance, as he had an attendance of 43.5% *vis-a-vis* the requirement which is 67.5%. Consequently, the petitioner No.1 was not permitted to take his second semester examination.
3. Mr. Satyanarain, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner No.1 was engaged in attending Court proceedings and the timing of the classes, i.e. 12 noon is a peak time during the Court working hours. It is, perhaps, for the said reason, the petitioner No.1 was unable to meet the prescribed attendance requirement of 67.5%
4. I have heard learned counsels for the parties.
5. In the present case, admittedly, the classes for LL.M. three year course, are conducted at 12 noon. The students, pursuing the said Course, are not required to suspend their Bar License during the course.
6. I am of the view that the very purpose of the LL.M. three year course is to enable students to continue practice before the Courts while simultaneously pursuing their Masters program.



7. Further, learned counsel for the petitioners, on instructions of the petitioner No.1, who is also present in Court, submits that the petitioner No.1 is willing to execute a bond, affidavit and given an undertaking to complete the shortfall in attendance during the succeeding semesters. He further undertakes that any arrears of fee, if payable, shall also be duly paid.
8. I am of the view that the same is fair and promotes the objective of the LL.M. three-year course and the petitioner No.1 shall be permitted to continue with his course.
9. The order is being passed in peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case.
10. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.
11. Since there is nobody representing other petitioners, the petition is dismissed *qua* the other petitioners.

JASMEET SINGH, J

AUGUST 13, 2026 / (MS)