



\$~163

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

CNR No. DLHC010477372026

+ **W.P.(C) 14692/2026 & CM APPL. 68739/2026**

UMEHABBEEBA QUADRI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manik Gupta, Adv
versus

JAMIA MILLIA ISLAMIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sabharwal, SC for R1 (
Appearance not given)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

05.10.2026

%

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

“a) Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction quashing the notices dated 18.09.2026 , 23.09.2026 and the notice dated 22.09.2026 (Page 41-43) and the consequential sealing of the Petitioner’s room and her forcible eviction from the Hostel on 25.09.2026, as being illegal, arbitrary, mala fide and unconstitutional;

b) Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing the Respondents forthwith to restore the Petitioner’s accommodation in the Begum Hazrat Mahal Girls’ Hostel for the remainder of the academic session 2026-27, on the terms on which it stood renewed on



14.08.2026, and to restore to her all her personal belongings;
c) Issue a writ of Prohibition or any other appropriate writ, order or direction restraining the Respondents from taking any coercive, disciplinary or retaliatory action against the Petitioner, on account of her participation in the residents' peaceful grievance regarding the quality of mess food;
d) To read down Clause 7 (f) as being an arbitrary and unreasonable criteria for disqualifying students from residing in the hostels. ...”

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner is a 20 years old student from Hyderabad and a student of B.A. (Hons.) Persian at the respondent No. 1 University. The petitioner is also engaged in the pro-bono teaching of students belonging to underprivileged sections of the society. According to the petitioner, she has been evicted from the hostel for raising a grievance about food served in the hostel mess. Hence, the present writ petition.

3. Mr. Sabharwal, learned standing counsel for respondent No. 1, states that as per the hostel manual, any student availing the hostel facilities has to score 55% and above aggregate marks in previous examinations. The relevant Clause No. 7(f) reads as under:-

f. The renewal of hostel admission would only be granted to those residents:-

“(i) Who have secured minimum 55% marks in aggregate in previous examination.

(ii) Have cleared all dues before appearing at the annual/semester examination.



(iii) The conduct report of the applicant from the concerned warden is satisfactory. There are no complaints of indiscipline and misbehavior with the hostel staff or fellow residents.”

4. Since the petitioner failed to secure the minimum criteria i.e., 55% aggregate in previous examinations, the benefits of hostel facilities have been withdrawn.

5. In response to the same, Mr. Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner, states that the said information was duly available with the respondent No. 1 at the time of allowing hostel accommodation facility. The petitioner has approached the respondents with clean hands and the respondents themselves found the petitioner eligible, despite having scored less than 55% marks in previous examinations.

6. Additionally, it is stated that the petitioner failed to secure 55% marks because the food served in the hostel mess was of bad quality, leading to deterioration of petitioner's health and typhoid.

7. I have heard learned counsels for the parties.

8. To my mind, the quality and hygiene of food served in hostel mess is of utmost importance as when it comes to students, they cannot be expected to perform to their full potential unless they are being provided good quality hygienic food. The respondent No. 1 University cannot be allowed to take a casual approach with regards to the same and the respondent No. 1 University should be extra careful about the quality and hygiene of the food.

9. Mr. Sabharwal, learned counsel for respondent No. 1, states that the contractor responsible for food preparation has been changed and now the food served in the hostel is of good quality. He assures the Court that the quality will be maintained and any complaint received from any student



would be immediately taken into consideration. He further states that on daily basis some staffs of the respondent No. 1 University would eat the hostel food with the students to ensure quality.

10. As far as the hostel accommodation of the petitioner is concerned, admittedly, the petitioner did not secure 55% marks in her previous examinations. Hence, the stand of the respondent No. 1 cannot be faulted.

11. At the same time, in view of the fact that the petitioner suffered from typhoid because of food served in the hostel mess, the respondent No. 1 is required to take a sympathetic view.

12. For the said reasons, the petition is disposed of directing the respondent No. 1 to consider the present petition as a representation and if any hostel accommodation remains unallotted to any students, the same may be allotted to the petitioner in a compassionate manner and the same may be decided immediately within 7 days.

13. The observations and findings recorded in this Order shall not be treated as a precedent.

14. The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

JASMEET SINGH, J

OCTOBER 5, 2026/NR