$~J

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

Judgment reserved on: 31.07.2026
Judgment pronounced on: 03.11.2026

\+ **W.P. (C) 13167/2025, CM . APPL. 53931/2025**

SUVAN YADUVANSHI ....Petitioner

Through: Mr. A.Velan, Mrs. Navpreet Kaur, Mr. Prince Singh, Mr. Nilay Rai, Mr. Rashiq Mukilan, Ms. Vanya Sharma, Mr. Yashvardhan Chauhan, Ms. Anoopa Tiwari, Advs.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI

& ORS. ....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder JS Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Ms. Tripta Sharma, Advs. Mr. Shankar Kumar Jha, SPC, UOI

\+

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

J U D G M E N T

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

"A. Issue a writ of Certiorified Mandamus or any other appropriate Writs/Directions/Orders to quash the order passed

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

by the 1st Respondent in REF NO.276058-SHIVAJIBHHS21-460-CW-3-21-I-FA and consequently direct Respondent No. 1 to allot a seat in BA (Hons) Program (History) in Shivaji College to the petitioner in the academic year 2025-26.

B. Issue a writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate Writs/Directions/Orders to quash the condition "It is mandatory for the candidates to appear in CUET (UG)-2025 in those subjects in which s(he) is appearing/has passed Class XII" from the Delhi University's Bulletin of Information 2025, for admission to UG programs as being Ultra Vires Article 14, 19(1)(g) and 21 of the Constitution of India, 1950.…"

FACTUAL MATRIX AS PER THE PETITION

2. The petitioner is a young aspirant who passed his Senior Secondary Examination in 2021 with 80% from the Central Board of Secondary Education in the subjects including English, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Physical Education, Work Experience, Health & Physical Education and General Studies, and is seeking admission for the undergraduate program in respondent No. 1, namely University of Delhi ***("DU")***.

3. The respondent No. 2, namely the National Testing Agency ***("NTA")***, conducts the Common University Entrance Test ***("CUET")***, which is a common exam for undergraduate/postgraduate courses at government universities. The respondent No. 3, namely the University Grants Commission ***("UGC")***, issued a Public Notice dated 11.12.2024 whereby it was stated that UGC has constituted an expert committee to review the conduct of CUET-UG and CUET-PE for 2025. It is stated by

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

the petitioner that the draft proposal mentioned that candidates will be allowed to take subjects in the CUET irrespective of the subjects opted in twelfth standard by them.

4. Pursuant thereto, the respondent No. 2 issued an invitation, *vide* an Information Bulletin dated 01.03.2025, for prospective applicants to undertake an entrance test/CUET for all central universities for the academic session 2025-26. The same was advertised as a single-window opportunity to seek admission in central universities across the country.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner filled out his application form bearing application No. 253510488025 in the first week of March, 2025. His chosen subjects for CUET-2025, i.e. English, Geography/Geology, History and Political Science, were different from the ones opted in Class XII by the petitioner.

6. In May 2025, the petitioner was allotted a provisional admit card on fulfilment of the first phase of his application. Subsequently, on 13.06.2025, the Kendriya Sainik Board issued the petitioner an Education Concession Certificate bearing No. 370/Adm/Edn Cert/2025/Vol-I.

7. On 04.07.2025, the respondent No. 2/NTA declared the result of the petitioner. Based on the same, the petitioner preferred the aforesaid application bearing No. 253510488025 in the required format, including the preferred choice of colleges as well as the preferred choice of programmes in those colleges. Thereafter, the petitioner was allotted admission to Shivaji College under B.A. (Hons) Program (History) on 15.08.2025 as per the marks obtained by him in CUET 2025.

8. However, on 17.08.2025, the petitioner found out that the said seat

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

allotted to him in Shivaji College under B.A. (Hons) Program (History) was rejected *vide* impugned order bearing Ref No. 276058-SHIVAJI-BHHS21-460-CW-3-21-I-FA for the reason of *"Non-fulfilment of the subject mapping criteria"*.

9. Multiple attempts were made by the petitioner along with his father to the respondent No. 1 for approval of verification of allotment of his son, but to no avail. Hence, the present petition.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

10. Mr. Velan, learned counsel for the petitioner, contends that the impugned rejection order dated 17.08.2025 fails to satisfy the triple test of fairness, transparency and non-exploitation laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *P.A. Inamdar & Ors. v. State of Maharashtra & Ors. AIR 2005 SC 3226* and *TMA Pai Foundation and Ors. v. State of Karnataka & Ors. (2002) 8 SCC 481*. Clause 5 of the important points of the Information Bulletin ***("Clause 5")*** issued by the respondent No. 1 for admission in undergraduate courses for the academic year 2025-26 is also stated to be in violation of the petitioner's right to education.

11. The learned counsel further submits that the said impugned rejection order and Clause 5 are in contravention of the National Education Policy, 2020 ***("NEP 2020")***, especially Clause 4.42, and its mandate for a more inclusive and flexible approach to higher education.

12. It is also contended that the denial of admission to the petitioner violates the principle of merit-based admission, considering the fact that the petitioner had secured a seat on inter-se merit in CUET-UG.

13. Reliance is placed on *Brij Mohan Lal v. Union of India & Ors. (2012) 6 SCC 502* to contend that the aforesaid Clause 5 fails to satisfy the tests

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

of reasonableness and fairness since the same does not align with the philosophy of inclusive education.

14. The judgement of *University of Delhi v. Ravindra Bishnoi 2023 SCC OnLine Del 6421* has been cited to emphasize that enforcing rigid subject prerequisites for undergraduate courses may lead to institutions inadvertently stifling the dynamism of young minds.

15. Furthermore, it is contended that the restriction imposed by the said Clause 5 on the petitioner's fundamental right to practice any profession is not backed by any statutory law. Reliance has been placed on *Krishnan Kakkanth v. Govt. of Kerala (1997) 9 SCC 495* for the same.

16. It has also been submitted that the respondent No. 1 does not apply the said subject mapping criteria for admission to B.A.LL.B. through CLAT. Hence, the similarly situated students are being treated differently without any reasonable classification.

17. Lastly, it has been contended that the rigid application of the said Clause 5 is unconstitutional, arbitrary and in defiance of public policy. Reliance is placed on *Charles K. Skaria v. C. Mathew (Dr) 1980 2 SCC 752*.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT NO. 1/DU

18. Mr. Rupal, learned standing counsel for the respondent No. 1, at the outset, submits that as per the petitioner's own showing, it is clear that the petitioner did not appear in the exam for the same subjects in CUET 2025 as compared to his Class XII subjects.

19. It is contended that, under Clause 4 of the CUET Information Bulletin for the academic year 2025-26, candidates are advised, before applying for CUET, to read the Prospectus displayed on the website of the University where admission is sought and to be clear about the subjects

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

to be chosen from the list of undergraduate programmes. The Bulletin of Information of the respondent No. 1/DU was released as early as 07.03.2025 in the public domain, and Clause 5 of the important points in the same specifically stated that for admission in the respondent No. 1 university, a candidate must appear in the CUET-UG 2025 in those subjects which he/she opted in Class XII. This has been further reiterated in the said Bulletin at various other places.

20. It is submitted that the petitioner registered by filling the CSAS admission form in June, 2025, wherein the petitioner specifically declared that he has done the correct Class XII subject mapping with CUET test papers. As part of the same admission form, it has been further undertaken by the petitioner that all the information furnished by him was correct to the best of his knowledge and, if found incorrect, his admission may be cancelled.

21. It is contended by the learned counsel that the petitioner has intentionally and *mala fide* given an incorrect declaration that his subjects in Class XII were the same as those in CUET.

22. Furthermore, it has been stated that the present writ petition has been filed after the admission process for the concerned academic year was already over, and since admissions have already been done as per the said impugned clause, the same cannot be challenged now.

23. Reliance is placed on this Court's judgement in *W.P. (C) No. 16897/2022* titled *Sonam Rawal v. University of Delhi & Ors.*

24. It has also been submitted that a similar writ petition before this Court bearing *W.P. (C) No. 11686/2024* has been dismissed, stating that once the petitioner had given the declaration that the appearance of the

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

students is strictly in accordance with the subject mapping criteria, the petitioner cannot be allowed admission contrary to the same.

25. It has also been stated that considering the concerned academic year has passed and even the admission process for the next academic year is about to close, the present writ petition has become infructuous.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

26. In the present case, the petitioner has sought admission for the academic year 2025-26. Not only is the academic year 2025-26 long over, academic year of 2026-27 is also underway. Hence, the petition has become infructuous. However, since the petitioner raises an important issue, I am proceeding to decide the same.

27. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties and perused the documents on record.

28. Accordingly, the main issues that arise for consideration are whether the subject mapping criteria as contained under Clause 5 of the Delhi University's Bulletin of Information 2025 for admission to undergraduate programs is violative of Articles 14, 19(1)(g) and 21 of the Constitution and consequently whether the impugned rejection order bearing Ref. No. 276058-SHIVAJI-BHHS21-460-CW-3-21-I-FA dated 17.08.2025 by respondent No. 1 deserves to be set aside.

29. Before examining the merits, it is apposite to examine the scope of interference by this Court under writ jurisdiction in academic/education matters.

Scope of interference in writ jurisdiction under Article 226 in academic/education matters

30. The law is crystallised on the scope of interference by the Court under

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

Article 226 of the Constitution of India with respect to academic and educational matters. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***All India Council for Technical Education v. Surinder Kumar Dhawan, (2009) 11 SCC 726*** has held as under:-

> *"17. The role of statutory expert bodies on education and the role of courts are well defined by a simple rule. If it is a question of educational policy or an issue involving academic matter, the courts keep their hands off. If any provision of law or principle of law has to be interpreted, applied or enforced, with reference to or connected with education, the courts will step in. In J.P. Kulshrestha (Dr.) v. Allahabad University [(1980) 3 SCC 418 : 1980 SCC (L&S) 436] this Court observed: (SCC pp. 424 & 426, paras 11 & 17)*
>
> *"11. ... Judges must not rush in where even educationists fear to tread. ...*
>
> ***
>
> *17. ... While there is no absolute ban, it is a rule of prudence that courts should hesitate to dislodge decisions of academic bodies.""*
>
> ***(emphasis supplied)***

31. The limited scope of the Court's interference in academic matters related to issues that fall within the domain of the experts was further reiterated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***UGC v. Neha Anil Bobde, (2013) 10 SCC 519,*** which reads as under:-

> *"31. We are of the view that, in academic matters, unless*

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

there is a clear violation of statutory provisions, the regulations or the notification issued, the courts shall keep their hands off since those issues fall within the domain of the experts. This Court in University of Mysore v. C.D. Govinda Rao [AIR 1965 SC 491] , Tariq Islam v. Aligarh Muslim University [(2001) 8 SCC 546 : 2002 SCC (L&S) 1] and Rajbir Singh Dalal v. Chaudhary Devi Lal University [(2008) 9 SCC 284 : (2008) 2 SCC (L&S) 887] , has taken the view that the court shall not generally sit in appeal over the opinion expressed by the expert academic bodies and normally it is wise and safe for the courts to leave the decision of the academic experts who are more familiar with the problem they face, than the courts generally are. UGC as an expert body has been entrusted with the duty to take steps as it may think fit for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in the university. For attaining the said standards, it is open to UGC to lay down any "qualifying criteria", which has a rational nexus to the object to be achieved, that is, for maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research. The candidates declared eligible for Lectureship may be considered for appointment as Assistant Professors in universities and colleges and the standard of such a teaching faculty has a direct nexus with the maintenance of standards of education to be imparted to the students of the universities and colleges. UGC has only

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

implemented the opinion of the experts by laying down the qualifying criteria, which cannot be considered as arbitrary, illegal or discriminatory or violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India."

(emphasis supplied)

32. The aforesaid view has been reaffirmed further by this Court in ***Sheetal v. Panna Dai School of Nursing, 2021 SCC OnLine Del 5288***. The relevant paragraph reads as under:

"10. ... The judgments of the Supreme Court inter alia in National Board of Examinations v. G Anand Ramamurthy, (2006) 5 SCC 515 [paragraph 7] and W.B. Central School Service Commission v. Abdul Halim, (2019) 18 SCC 39 [paragraph 30-31] also make it clear that the interpretation of eligibility conditions is generally a matter left to the academic authorities and the writ court is slow to interfere in the absence of manifest arbitrariness or perversity. The fact that the petitioner participated in the selection process pursuant to this advertisement and did not ventilate the grievances at the right time also comes in her way."

(emphasis supplied)

33. A perusal of the aforesaid precedents would clearly conclude that there exists a self-imposed fetter on Courts when it comes to interference in decisions concerning education or academic matters. In view of the same, I shall now deal with rival contentions of the parties.

Validity of the subject-mapping criteria under Clause 5 of the Delhi University's Bulletin of Information 2025

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

34. The petitioner's main contention is that Clause 5 is arbitrary and violates Articles 14, 19(1)(g) and 21 of the Constitution, as it fails the triple test of fairness, transparency and non-exploitation and the tests of reasonableness and fairness. It is contended that the said Clause is contrary to NEP 2020 and its mandate for a more inclusive and flexible approach to higher education, as well as the UGC Public Notice dated 11.12.2024, whose draft proposal allowed candidates to take different CUET subjects irrespective of those opted in Class XII. It is further contended that the said Clause ignores merit, since the petitioner secured a seat on inter-se merit in CUET-UG, and that it violates his right to education. It is also argued that the said Clause results in discrimination, as the respondent No. 1 does not apply the subject mapping criteria for admission to B.A. LL.B. through CLAT, thereby treating similarly situated students differently without any reasonable classification.

35. On the contrary, the respondent No. 1 contends that Clause 5 was published in the public domain on 07.03.2025, and that Clause 4 of the CUET Information Bulletin itself advised candidates to read the university's prospectus before choosing their subjects for CUET 2025. It is further submitted that the said Clause applies uniformly to all candidates, and that the petitioner admittedly did not appear in CUET in the subjects he had studied in Class XII.

36. The impugned Clause 5 reads as under:-

> *"5. For admission to University of Delhi, it is mandatory for the candidate to appear in CUET (UG) – 2025 in those subjects in which s(he) is appearing/has passed Class XII."*

37. Clause 5 is an eligibility condition laid down by the respondent No. 1

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

for admission to its undergraduate programmes. In view of ***Neha Anil Bobde (supra)***, this Court will not interfere with a qualifying criterion that has a rational nexus to the object sought to be achieved unless there is a clear violation of a statutory provision, regulation or notification. Accordingly, the question that arises for consideration is whether Clause 5 violates any statute, regulation or notification and whether it has a rational nexus to its object.

38. The objective of the said Clause as stated in paragraph 9 of the counter Affidavit dated 04.09.2026 reads as under:-

> *"9. This mandatory condition has been laid down by the experts in the academic field of the University of Delhi so to discourage the candidates from seeking resort to study altogether different subjects from shadow schools without attending the classes. It is needless to mention that such malpractice has been strongly objected to. That a student of class XII examination while appearing in the class XII examination in totally different streams of subject cannot prepare for altogether different subjects in CUET Examination which is held almost immediately after the XII Class examination by various boards. Therefore, such mandatory condition has rational basis and cannot be challenged moreover when the same was in vogue even in the last academic year 2024-2025. It is well laid down Principle of law that the decisions of the experts on which the academic policies of the University are based cannot be*

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

interfered with under article 226 of the Constitution of India."

39. A perusal of the aforesaid paragraph shows that the objective of the clause seems to be that the candidates admitted to a programme should have studied the foundational subjects at the Class XII level and have been tested in those subjects. The same has a direct nexus with the standard of teaching and eligibility of students. The said Clause applies equally to all students/candidates, was published even before the admission process had commenced, i.e. on 07.03.2025, and is not shown to be capricious in any form. Therefore, the impugned clause has a reasonable nexus with the objective it seeks to achieve. Furthermore, whether a different criterion would be better to test a candidate's eligibility is a matter for the respondent No. 1 university and its experts to decide.

40. The reliance placed by the petitioner on the UGC Public Notice dated 11.12.2024 and the draft proposal is misplaced. The notice stated that an expert committee was constituted to review the conduct of CUET 2025 and the said proposal was merely a draft. The same does not bind the respondent No. 1 university or can prevail over the eligibility criteria clearly mentioned in the Information Bulletin of the concerned university governing admissions.

41. In fact, the petitioner has not shown any binding regulation of the respondent No. 3 that prohibits a university from prescribing a subject mapping criterion. The respondent No. 2's own Information Bulletin dated 01.03.2025 directed the candidates to the concerned university's prospectus for programme-specific requirements. The relevant portion

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

of the same reads as under:-

> **4. Instructions for filling Online Application Form:**
>
> i. Before starting to fill the application form candidates are advised to read the Prospectus displayed on the website of the University/ies where admission is sought and be clear about the programmes offered by them, seats available, eligibility as regards age, passing/appearing in qualifying exam, minimum marks in the qualifying exam, relaxation there of, reservation, admission procedure, subject to be chosen from list of UG Programmes available at https://cuet.nta.nic.in/ in CUET etc. before applying for the CUET (UG) – 2025.
>
> ii. NTA will not entertain the corrections sent by the candidate through Post/Fax/WhatsApp/E-mail/by Hand.
>
> iii. Download the **Information Bulletin and** read carefully to ensure your eligibility.

42. The aforesaid along with the subject mapping criterion in respondent No. 1 university has been further reaffirmed in the Information Bulletin of the respondent No. 1 university, the relevant portions of which read as under:-

> **Program Specific Eligibilities**
>
> Candidate must refer to the Program-Specific Eligibility to choose the subjects in which s(he) should appear in CUET (UG) – 2025.
>
> It is mandatory for the candidates to appear in CUET(UG)-2025 in those subjects in which s(he) is appearing/ has passed Class XII. For the purpose of ascertaining Program Specific Eligibility and for mapping the CUET subject(s) with Class XII subject(s), marksheet of more than one recognized board may be considered provided the candidate has passed those subjects in Class XII.
>
> 8. The candidate is advised to check that s(he) satisfies all eligibility criteria for the Program(s) for which s(he) is appearing in CUET (UG) - 2025. Admission is subject to the candidate's fulfilling the eligibility requirements prescribed for applying to the concerned program of study. In case a candidate does not meet any of the eligibility criteria prescribed for applying to the concerned program and appears in the entrance test, it is at the candidate's own risk and cost. If at any stage, it is found that eligibility requirement/s is/are not fulfilled, the admission, if granted, shall be cancelled ipso facto.
>
> 10. The candidate must read the Program-Specific requirements carefully and then appear in Language/s and/ or Domain Specific Subjects of the CUET (UG) - 2025.

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

13. Before registering for CUET (UG) - 2025, the candidate is advised to carefully read the Bulletin of Information (BOI) 2025-26 and consult the University of Delhi Act, 1922 and the Statutes. The Ordinances, Rules and Regulations of the University of Delhi, available on the University website, would be binding on them.

43. The petitioner's contention that Clause 5 has no statutory backing is misplaced. The power to prescribe eligibility conditions is inherent in a university's power to admit students, and the petitioner has not shown any statutory provision that denies respondent No. 1 that power. This Court in ***W.P. (C) 13525/2021*** titled ***Alkeshwari Negi v. University of Delhi & Anr.*** upheld the eligibility criteria specified by the university for postgraduate admissions, stating as under:-

> *"11. In any event, the petitioner's arguments on merits also do not appeal to me. The University has laid down the particular manner in which 24 credits should be earned for a candidate to be admitted to postgraduate courses. Whether six courses of four credits each are sufficient, or four courses of six credits should be required, is a matter of policy. The writ court is generally loathe to interfere with eligibility criteria laid down by academic experts, unless they are shown to be manifestly arbitrary or unreasonable.*
>
> *14. The University's decision requiring a candidate for a postgraduate course to have completed a certain number of undergraduate courses in the same subject with a higher credit level cannot be characterised as arbitrary or unreasonable in this context."*

44. The aforesaid principle applies with equal force here. Whether a candidate must be tested in the subjects studied in Class XII is a matter

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

of academic policy, and Clause 5 cannot be termed to be arbitrary or unreasonable. Any hardship to an individual candidate does not render the criterion arbitrary.

45. The petitioner's reliance on NEP 2020 is misplaced since the same is a statement of policy and cannot be said to create an enforceable right to admission irrespective of eligibility conditions.

46. This Court in ***Hrithik Rana v. Delhi University Sports Council, 2020 SCC OnLine Del 1822*** held that a prospectus issued by the University is binding on the students as well as the University, stating as under:-

> *"14. Thirdly, it is settled legal position that the terms of the brochure are binding upon a candidate. A candidate cannot after having participated in the selection process and after having been rejected for any reasons turn around and challenge the terms of the criteria of the admission brochure. In the present case, the petitioner has applied under the Bulletin of Information. He cannot after having participated in the selection process turn around and seek to challenge the terms of the stipulated in the selection process. In this context reference may be had to the judgment of a coordinate Bench of this court in the case of Priyanka Chaudhary v. National Board of Examinations, 2016 SCC OnLine Del 5691 where this court held as follows:*
>
> *"11. The petitioners were well aware of the rules laid down by the information bulletin and despite the same the petitioners participated in the counseling process without*

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

any demur. The petitioners have opted for confirmed seats and have taken admission. No doubt that the petitioners are meritorious, but on account of the application of the rules as laid down by the information bulletin, which is clear in terms of its application, the petitioners are clearly ineligible to participate in the second round of counseling commencing from 21-10-2016.""

(emphasis supplied)

47. Similarly, this Court in ***W.P. (C) 16897/2022*** titled ***Sonam Rawal v. University of Delhi & Ors.*** held as under:-

"20. Again, a Coordinate Bench in Hritik Rana vs. Delhi Sports Council and Ors., (2020) SCC OnLine DEL 1822, emphasized on the binding character of the terms of brochure as well as on the principle of estoppel that a candidate cannot after having unsuccessfully participated in the selection process turn around and challenge the terms of criteria of the admission brochure…"

(emphasis supplied)

48. A perusal of ***Sonam Rawal (supra)*** shows that the Bulletin of Information by any university has the force of law and binds the candidate, and that no estoppel or legitimate expectation can be invoked against it, even where the University's own admission form carried an inconsistent entry. It further shows that a candidate who knew the eligibility criteria and participated without demur cannot challenge the same after an unsuccessful outcome, and that a Court cannot direct an institution to act contrary to its own published rules.

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

49. The contention of the petitioner with respect to merit also fails in view of the fact that even though the petitioner secured a seat on inter-se merit in CUET-UG 2025, the same is a criterion for ranking students who are eligible and does not substitute for a candidate's eligibility.

50. The reliance placed on ***P.A. Inamdar (supra)*** and ***TMA Pai Foundation (supra)*** by the petitioner is misplaced. The said judgments dealt with the admission procedures of private unaided professional institutions, and the triple test of fairness, transparency and non-exploitation was laid down to prevent arbitrary and exploitative practices such as capitation fees. The present case concerns a central university's published eligibility criterion for admission to an undergraduate programme. Even otherwise, the impugned Clause 5 is transparent, published well in advance, applies uniformly to all candidates and involves no element of exploitation.

51. The reliance placed by the petitioner on ***Ravindra Bishnoi (supra)*** is misplaced as the same is distinguishable from the present case. In the said case, a student who had studied Geography and English Literature was denied a seat in B.A. (Hons.) Geography after he chose History in CUET, English Literature not being offered, relying on the "closely related subject" exception in the University's Bulletin. The Hon'ble Division Bench held that the University had arbitrarily denied him that exception without framing any criteria. The validity of subject mapping was not in issue, and the observations on rigid prerequisites were general and did not hold that a university cannot prescribe such a condition. In the present case, no such exception is pleaded by the petitioner. He does not contend that his CUET subjects were closely

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

related to his Class XII subjects, or that any of them were unavailable in CUET. Unlike the student in ***Ravindra Bishnoi (supra)***, who acted in good faith, the petitioner herein gave an incorrect declaration on subject mapping and came to this Court only after the admission process had ended.

52. The contention of the petitioner that similarly situated students are being treated differently without any reasonable classification with regard to admission to B.A. LL.B. is misplaced. Article 14 of the Constitution prohibits unequal treatment. However, B.A. LL.B. is a different programme with a different admission mechanism and different academic requirements. Prescribing different eligibility conditions for different programmes is a reasonable classification and falls within the domain of academic bodies. Further, unlike a discipline-specific honours programme, B.A. LL.B. is a professional degree with no corresponding Class XII subject requirement, and the two cannot be treated as similarly placed.

53. The petitioner's contention that Clause 5 is arbitrary and contrary to public policy by placing reliance on ***Charles K. Skaria v. C. Mathew (1980) 2 SCC 752*** is also misplaced. In the said case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that a requirement in prospectus to attach the diploma certificate to the application was only a directory mode of proof, but that possession of the diploma by the cut-off date was mandatory. The observations against a formal and strict reading of the prospectus thus concern procedural requirements and do not dilute a substantive eligibility condition. In the present case, the impugned Clause 5 is a substantive condition, and the petitioner herein admittedly

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

did not satisfy it. No procedural lapse is sought to be excused here. As stated above, Clause 5 has a rational nexus with its object, was published in advance and applies uniformly. Therefore, the same is neither arbitrary nor contrary to public policy.

54. Additionally, Common Seat Allocation System***("CSAS")*** admission form of the petitioner, which included the declaration with respect to subject mapping criteria, is reproduced hereinbelow:-

> *"I declare that I have done the correct class XII subject mapping with CUET test papers."*

55. This Court in another similar matter bearing ***W.P.(C) 11686/2024*** titled ***G Jahnav Prem Sai v. University of Delhi & Anr.*** dismissed the challenge to said Clause 5 on the ground that a petitioner therein gave a declaration of compliance with the subject-mapping criteria and cannot be allowed admission contrary to the same. The relevant extract reads as under:-

> *"6. In the instant case, if the petitioner, had any grievance with respect to clause 5 of the brochure, the petitioner ought to have challenged the same at the relevant point of time. Having appeared at the concerned examination and having tendered the undertaking to abide by the eligibility conditions as stipulated in the brochure, the petitioner cannot be allowed to challenge the validity of clause 5 of the brochure at this belated stage."*

56. I am of the view that the right to education under Article 21 of the Constitution does not extend to a right to be given a seat in a programme of one's choice without satisfying the eligibility conditions. Therefore,

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

for the said reasons, the subject-mapping criteria under Clause 5 of the Delhi University's Bulletin of Information 2025 is not violative of Articles 14, 19(1)(g) and 21 of the Constitution. Accordingly, the challenge to said Clause 5 cannot even stand on merits.

Validity of the impugned rejection order

57. The petitioner contends that the impugned rejection order fails the triple test of fairness, transparency and non-exploitation, violates the principle of merit-based admission and the same is arbitrary and unconstitutional. On the other hand, the respondent No. 1 contends that the petitioner's application was rejected due to non-fulfilment of the subject mapping criteria, which the petitioner did not satisfy and had wrongly declared that he did.

58. The impugned rejection order reads as under:-

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

Seat Allocation Application Details 253510488025, Ref. No. 276058-SHIVAJI-BHHS21-460-CW-3-21-I-FA

Name	SUVAN YADUVANSHI
Form Number	253510488025
Reference Number	276058-SHIVAJI-BHHS21-460-CW-3-21-I-FA
Program	B.A. (Hons.) History
College	Shivaji College
Score	101 : English : 131.8033364 313 : Geography/Geology : 151.7618446 314 : History : 107.1852169 323 : Political Science : 81.3184278 **Total Score : 472.0688257**
Allocation	UNDER ARMED FORCES CATEGORY ROUND-I
Seat Category	CW
Gender	Male
Applicant Category	Unreserved (UR)
Kashmiri Migrant	Not Applicable
Pwd Category	Not Applicable
Minority	Not Applicable
Email	suvanyaduvanshi@gmail.com
Mobile	8968805785
Choice	9
Board Roll No./ Board Passing Year	11694081 / 2021
Board	CENTRAL BOARD OF SECONDARY EDUCATION(CBSE)
Allocation Date	2025-08-15 Seat Allocation Accepted :Yes Seat Allocation Accepted at:2025-08-17 06:10:05
College Remarks	Wrong Subject mapping case
Application Status	Application Rejected 3. Non-fulfillment of the subject-mapping criteria.
Queries raised by college	

59. In view of the aforesaid finding that the impugned Clause 5 is valid and the admitted fact that the petitioner's admission that his CUET subjects were different from those opted in Class XII, the impugned rejection of the petitioner's application rests on a valid condition and is based on

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

facts which are not in dispute.

60. The provisional allotment of the petitioner on 15.08.2025 was subject to verification of eligibility, and a provisional allotment does not create a vested right to a seat. This Court in ***Pragya Chaudhary v. Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, 2012 SCC OnLine Del 724*** held as under:-

> *"8. In the present case, the emphasis laid by the counsel for the petitioner on the correspondence resting between respondent No. 3/CCIM and respondent No. 2/college cannot be of much assistance to the petitioner, inasmuch as the eligibility criteria prescribed for admission to the BAMS Course had been clearly laid down in the admission brochure and respondent No. 2/College was required to strictly adhere to the same. The aforesaid eligibility criteria was admittedly in public domain as long back as on 15.03.2011. In the present case, the petitioner had passed her XII class in the year 2009. Therefore, when she had applied for admission to the BAMS course, she was well aware of her aggregate PCB percentage in class XII. Despite the same, the petitioner took a chance, which can only be termed as a calculated risk to apply for admission to the aforesaid course in respondent No. 1/University. Thereafter, respondent No. 2/college gave provisional admission to the petitioner. But, merely because the admission granted to the petitioner was provisional in nature and thereafter she has been studying in respondent*

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54

No. 2/college since November 2011, cannot be a ground to sustain her admission in the light of the terms and conditions of eligibility prescribed in the Brochure and reiterated in the impugned letter dated 05.12.2011 issued by respondent No. 1/University, wherein the request of respondent No. 2/college to lower the minimum eligibility criteria prescribed in the admission brochure for 20 students was declined."

61. The merit in CUET is determined as per ranking among eligible candidates, and the petitioner was not eligible as under the said Clause 5. Accordingly, the rejection order is not arbitrary or illegal and therefore does not warrant this Court's interference under writ jurisdiction.

CONCLUSION

62. Therefore, I find no ground to interfere with the impugned rejection order and/or with Clause 5 of the Delhi University's Bulletin of Information 2025. Accordingly, the petitioner is not entitled to the reliefs sought.

63. In view of the aforesaid, the present petition is dismissed, along with pending applications, if any.

64. The document handed over in Court is taken on record.

JASMEET SINGH, J.

NOVEMBER 3, 2026/(SR)

Signed By:ANSH SRIVASTAVA
Signing Date:03.11.2026 17:54