



\$~33 to 35

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

+ W.P.(C) 54/2023

PREETI AND ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. C. Kranthi Kumar, Mr. Rohan Kumar, Mr. Amaan Shreyas and Mr. Vijay Kumar, Advs.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ankur Chibber and Mr. Anshuman Mehrotra, Advs.

+ W.P.(C) 1384/2023

RANJAN KUMAR & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. C. Kranthi Kumar, Adv.

versus

THE UNIVERSITY OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ankur Chibber and Mr. Anshuman Mehrotra, Advs.

+ W.P.(C) 711/2023, CM APPL. 18817/2023

TANSHI BHARTI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. C. Kranthi Kumar, Adv.

versus

THE UNIVERSITY OF DELHI, THROUGH ITS REGISTRAR & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal and Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Advs.



CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR SHARMA

ORDER
% 11.02.2025

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner at the outset has stated that the recommendations made by Prof. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur in the report of the Result Grievance Committee (RGC) Faculty of Law, LLB 24 Law-II, IV & VI examination August/ September 2022 should be implemented.
2. The report of the Result Grievance Committee was filed along with the counter affidavit of Dr. Vikas Gupta, Registrar, University of Delhi, along with the affidavit dated 25.09.2023.
3. Learned counsel for the University of Delhi has submitted that, in fact, all such recommendations have been accepted. However, the University, in any case, is bound by the recommendations made by the Result Grievance Committee.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be satisfied if all these recommendations are implemented by the University.
5. In these circumstances, the following recommendation made in the Result Grievance Committee be implemented by the University of Delhi:
 - I. A proper Orientation program should be conducted for all faculty members/examiners in order to properly apprise them of the abovementioned concerns, in order to avoid their recurrence in future.
 - II. A joint evaluation meeting must always be conducted by the Conveners of all subjects in their respective subjects from time to time, especially before paper setting and before starting the evaluation exercise in order to ensure uniformity in evaluation.
 - III. It has been observed that a lot of faculty members do not attend the subject meetings. A case in point is the subject meeting in respect



- of LB-301: Constitutional Law-I, in which only 12 out of 25 faculty members/examiners were present, despite advance notice
- IV. It is strongly recommended that attending the subject meetings should be made mandatory for all faculty members/examiners, including Guest Faculty.
- V. Subject Conveners should be requested to supervise evaluation work in their respective subjects, in order to ensure uniformity in evaluation.
- VI. Students should be encouraged to mention correct question numbers in their scripts, while attempting each question in the examination.
6. It is also pertinent to mention here that all other contentions are left open.
7. Accordingly, the petition stands disposed of.

DINESH KUMAR SHARMA, J

FEBRUARY 11, 2025/PU/HT