



\$~84

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

% *Judgment Delivered on: 09.10.2025*

+ W.P.(C) 13759/2025 and CM APPL. 56418/2025

HITESH KUMAR .....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner-in-person.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra and Ms. Mayuri Lende, Advs.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN**

**JUDGMENT**

**VIKAS MAHAJAN, J (ORAL)**

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner, a candidate belonging to the Scheduled Caste (SC) category, who appeared in the CUET PG Examination held on 26.03.2025 for the purpose of seeking admission to LL.M. course for the Academic Year 2025-26.
2. It is stated in the petition that the petitioner has secured 167 marks in the CUET PG Examination.
3. The grievance which has been articulated by the petitioner is that at the time of Spot Round III of admissions, the respondent/University did not upload the public notice on dedicated 'PG Admission' tab of its website where earlier notices had consistently been posted.



4. The petitioner appearing in person submits that on the home page of the said website, a dedicated tab for PG admission is provided where all previous notifications were uploaded.
5. He further submits that on the same home page, after scrolling down, there is also a place for notification for PG applicants, where the notification of Spot Round III was published.
6. He submits that earlier at both the above mentioned places, all notifications such as cut-offs, details of vacant seats and prior spot rounds were published.
7. He further submits that a total of 21 notifications had been issued on the dedicated page as well as the home page.
8. In this backdrop, he submits that the conduct of the respondent/University in deviating from the established practice of publishing notices both on home page, as well as, on dedicated PG Admission page, is arbitrary, as it has deprived not only the petitioner but also several other students of the opportunity to apply for the said course.
9. He submits that the petitioner has secured a score of 167 whereas minimum allocation score was 158 marks in the third round of counselling and the petitioner would have surely got admission had the notification *qua* third spot round of counselling been notified at the dedicated page as well, since the petitioner was keeping watch only on the dedicated page and not on the home page.
10. *Per contra*, Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent/University submits that the respondent/University cannot be held responsible for the candidates' failure to apprise themselves of the admission schedule, guidelines, eligibility criteria, as per the



provisions of CSAS (PG) – 2025. He submits that the onus lies squarely upon each applicant to remain vigilant.

11. According to him, it is incumbent upon every candidate to keep himself informed by regularly checking the official admission website of the respondent/University.

12. He submits that the admission process for LL.M. programme has since been concluded, and all available seats have been filled in accordance with the prescribed admission process, therefore, no vacancy is presently available against which the candidature of petitioner can be considered. He further contends that even the course has commenced in the first week of August, 2025.

13. I have heard the petitioner appearing in person, as well as, Mr. Rupal.

14. It is the case of petitioner, as borne out from paras 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the writ petition, that previous notifications were published on the home page and dedicated 'PG Admission' tab of the website of respondent/University.

15. On being queried by the Court, the petitioner also fairly concedes that the earlier notifications, which were published by the respondent/University in respect of PG admissions, were available both at the home page, as well as, on the dedicated 'PG Admission' tab.

16. Therefore, admittedly, the petitioner was aware that the information, which was being disseminated by the respondent/University, was available at more than one location in the website, i.e., home page, as well as, dedicated 'PG Admission' tab.

17. This being the position, the duty was cast upon the petitioner to remain vigilant and check all the places where there was a known possibility of information being published.



18. On further being queried by the Court as to which page opens when the official website link of the respondent/University i.e. [www.admission.uod.ac.in](http://www.admission.uod.ac.in) is clicked, the petitioner fairly states that it is the home page which first opens on clicking the said website link.

19. Thus, the contention of the petitioner that he missed the crucial update with regard to third spot round that was available on the home page, is rendered untenable.

20. The screenshot of home page which has been annexed as Annexure-G to the present petition also shows that the notice with regard to PG Admission Spot Round III was available at conspicuous place on the very first page which one visits immediately on clicking the website link of the respondent/University. Therefore, the petitioner cannot claim that he missed the information on the primary tab while navigating to a secondary tab.

21. Even the contention of the petitioner that ‘Bulletin of Information PG Admissions 25-26’ has failed to disclose a specific location for the publication of information regarding PG admissions, does not hold any water. A perusal of Bulletin of Information under the heading of ‘Important Points’ explicitly states in points 21, 22 and 23 that candidates are required to check the website of respondent/University for updates and for notifications regarding PG admissions by visiting [www.admission.uod.ac.in](http://www.admission.uod.ac.in).

22. The relevant excerpts from the Bulletin of Information is reproduced below:

*“21. Candidates who win be taking admissions In academic session 2025- 26, will be studying under the Postgraduate Curriculum Framework (PGCF)- 2025, based on the NEP-2020. Candidates are advised to keep checking the website of the University of Delhi for academic and other updates.*



22. *Candidates are advised to regularly check the admission website for any updates and grievances Any grievance pertaining to candidate's lack of awareness of the published information and updates will not be entertained.*
23. *For notifications and updates regarding Postgraduate (PG) Admissions, please visit: [www.admission.uod.ac.in](http://www.admission.uod.ac.in)”*

23. In view of the above specific information available in the Bulletin of Information, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner cannot be permitted to take refuge in mere technicality especially when the petitioner was well aware that apart from the dedicated ‘PG Admission’ tab, the information is also available on the home page which opens immediately upon visiting official website of the respondent/University.

24. A query is also posed by the Court to the petitioner as to whether any candidate got selected during Spot Round-III, he fairly states that two candidates were selected in the said round. In that view of the matter, this Court is of the opinion that when other candidates could notice the notification qua Spot Round-III at the home page of the official website, petitioner cannot be allowed to contend that he was keeping watch only on the dedicated tab of ‘PG Admission’ and not on the ‘Home Page’.

25. That apart, the stand of the University is that presently no vacancy is available and admission process has since been concluded. The present petition has been filed on or about 07.09.2025, whereas the course commenced in the early part of August, 2025. For these reasons as well, this Court is not persuaded to grant any relief to the petitioner, all the more, when the last selected candidate in the SC category, who is likely to be



2025:DHC:9054



displaced in the event present petition is allowed, has not been impleaded as party in the present petition.

26. In view of the above discussion, this Court does not find any merit in the petition. Accordingly, the petition along with pending application stands dismissed.

**OCTOBER 09, 2025**

aj

**VIKAS MAHAJAN, J**