



\$~7

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

Date of Decision: 13.02.2026

+ **LPA 631/2025 & CM APPL. 63985/2025, CM APPL. 63986/2025,
CM APPL. 63987/2025, CM APPL. 63988/2025**

JIGYANSH GADI

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Ajay Kr. Pipaniya, Advocate.

Versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Santosh Kumar, Mr. Devansh Malhotra, Advocates for R-1.

Mr. Ankur Chhibber and Mr Anshuman Mehrotra, Advocate for R-2.

Mr. Sandeep Chaudhary, Advocate for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

TEJAS KARIA, J. (ORAL)

1. The Appellant has filed the present Appeal being aggrieved by the Judgment dated 26.08.2025 (“**Impugned Judgment**”) passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.(C) No.11541/2025 (“**Writ Petition**”), thereby dismissing the Writ Petition filed by the Appellant seeking a direction to the Respondents to grant admission to the Appellant in B. Com (Hons.) Course at Respondent No. 2-Shri Ram College of Commerce (“**College**”) and to set aside the rejection dated 23.07.2025 whereby Appellant’s application seeking



admission in Respondent No. 2-College was rejected with the remark “Application Rejected – Invalid category documents / certificate submitted”.

2. The brief facts leading to the filing of the present Appeal are as under:

2.1 On 07.3.2025, Respondent No. 1-University of Delhi published Bulletin of Information (“**Bulletin**”) and Common Seat Allocation System (“**CSAS**”) for admission to Undergraduate Programs and Common Seat Allocation System for academic session 2025-26, which prescribed the requisite documents to be submitted in stipulated format and timelines.

2.2 The Appellant, a differently abled person, on 22.03.2025 applied for the Common University Entrance Test (Under Graduate) – 2025 Examination (“**CUET**”) under the Persons with Benchmark Disabilities (“**PwBD**”) category.

2.3 At the time of CUET registration, the Appellant submitted medical and psycho-educational documents evidencing his specific learning disability and other medical records issued by certified authorities under Section 2(r) of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (“**RPwD Act**”). The same were duly accepted by Respondent No. 1-University of Delhi and the Appellant was allowed to sit in CUET.

2.4 The National Testing Agency (“**NTA**”) based on the medical documents submitted by the Appellant, issued admit card to the Appellant under the PwBD category. The Appellant was also granted all applicable benefits for PwBD candidates, including compensatory time and support accommodations.

2.5 On 04.07.2025, the result of the CUET was declared and the



Appellant's name came in the first cut-off list under the PwBD category published by the Respondent No. 1-University of Delhi and the Appellant was allotted a set in B. Com (Hons.) course at Respondent No. 2 - College.

2.6 On 20.07.2025, the Admission Committee of Respondent No. 2- College directed the Appellant to upload a valid PwBD Certificate ("**Disability Certificate**") linked with Unique Disability ID ("**UDID**") by 21.07.2025 besides the certified medical documents issued by the certified authority in favour of the Appellant.

2.7 The Appellant submitted all the relevant documents including acknowledgment dated 11.07.2025 issued by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment for applying for Disability Certificate and medical referrals from the Institute of Human Behaviour and Allied Sciences.

2.8 On 23.07.2025, the Respondent No. 2-College rejected the Appellant's application with the remark that "Application Rejected – Invalid category documents / certificate submitted". On the same day, the Appellant sent an e-mail to Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 requesting them for some considerable and reasonable time to furnish the requisite documents, however, the Respondent No. 2-College rejected the said request of the Appellant.

2.9 Aggrieved by the rejection dated 23.07.2025, the Appellant preferred the Writ Petition, which was dismissed by the learned Single Judge by the Impugned Judgment, against which the Appellant has preferred the present Appeal.



3. The main grievance of the Appellant is that the Appellant was denied the admission in Respondent No. 2-College despite qualifying CUET for admission in PwBD category and submitting the documents issued by the certified authority in accordance with Section 2(r) of the RPwD Act, which were duly accepted by Respondent No.1 - University of Delhi at the time of allowing the Appellant to sit in CUET. The Appellant challenged the action of Respondent No. 2-College for requiring the Appellant to provide the Disability Certificate within a short period of one day as being arbitrary and infringing the rights of the Appellant under Articles 14, 15 and 21 of the Constitution of India, 1950 and the doctrine of reasonable accommodation as enshrined under the RPwD Act.

4. The learned Counsel for the Appellant submitted that admittedly, the Appellant is a meritorious differently abled candidate and has availed and was granted benefits under PwBD category during his entire school life. The Appellant has challenged the window of single day to provide the Disability Certificate on ground of it being unjust and unfair since obtaining the Disability Certificate involves an elaborate medical process and it was beyond the control of the Appellant to obtain the same within one day.

5. The learned Counsel for the Appellant submitted that the Impugned Judgment ignores the concept of reasonable accommodation under Sections 2(y), 2(c) and 16 of the RPwD Act and fails to apply the doctrine of legitimate expectation arising out of the doctrine of reasonable accommodation. It was also submitted that rejection of the Appellant's admission is indirect discrimination and the time of one day to comply with the requirement to provide the Disability Certificate was disproportionate as the PwBD candidates by nature require more time and accommodation to complete such procedure.



6. The Appellant has submitted that the Appellant ought to have been granted sympathetic consideration as the Appellant was in possession of multiple medical records issued by recognized hospitals including Government Institutions to establish his disability as nothing in the Bulletin or CSAS forbids provisional measures in exceptional cases.

7. According to the Appellant, the Impugned Judgment wrongly described the Appellant's conduct as lackadaisical without appreciating that the Appellant, being a minor PwBD candidate with a psychological disorder, had limited means to fully comprehend the procedural nuisances. It was submitted that the Appellant acted with diligence immediately when Respondent No. 2 - College raised the demand for the Disability Certificate by promptly approaching the concerned authorities as the Appellant was under *bona fide* impression that the documents already submitted were sufficient as the same were accepted in the past for giving CUET.

8. The learned Counsel for the Appellant further contended that the CSAS provisions are not mandatory, contrary to the conclusion reached in the Impugned Judgment as these clauses are subordinate to the statutory mechanism of RPwD Act, particularly given the undisputed disability status of the Appellant, which necessitated the exercise of discretionary powers to prevent discrimination.

9. The Appellant has relied upon the following judgments in support of the above submissions:

- ***Justice Sunanda Bhandare Foundation v. Union of India & Anr.***, (2014) 14 SCC 383 holding that that the Executive must be liberal in disability matters;
- ***S. Krishna Sradha v. State of A.P.***, (2020) 17 SCC 465 holding that



technicalities cannot defeat right to education;

- **Re: Recruitment of Visually Impaired in Judicial Services, 2025** SCC OnLine SC 481, holding that indirect discrimination is impermissible;
- **Suyash Suryakant Patil v. National Medical Commission & Ors.**, (2025) SCC OnLine Bom 369, **Shahid Akeel Shaikh v. Union of India**, (2024) SCC OnLine Bom 3027, and **Dhunoon Khan v. Union of India**, W.P.(C) No. 2191/2023, where PwBD candidate was granted admission even after deadlines, by way of supernumerary seats or provisional admission, and by giving an undertaking on provisional seat;
- **S. Krishna Sradha v. State of Andhra Pradesh & Ors.**, (2020) 17 SCC 465, holding that denial of fair and transparent treatment in admissions violates Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India, 1950 and any illegal denial must be remedied by restoring the candidate to their original position;
- **Chandigarh Admin & Ors. v. Jasmine Kaur & Ors.**, (2014) 10 SCC 521, holding that in exceptional circumstances, where the candidate is without fault and the illegality lies solely with the authorities, the Court may grant admission as exceptional relief within the prescribed schedule to uphold equality and fairness.

10. The learned Counsel for Respondent No. 1-University of Delhi has submitted that the entire admission process is governed by a uniform, transparent and time-bound admission framework laid down in CSAS and Bulletin, which were publicly notified well in advance and are binding on all



the applicants, which required uploading all requisite certificates in the prescribed formats within the specific time notified and any failure to submit documents results in automatic rejection of the candidature, without any discretion to relax or waive such compliance.

11. It was further submitted on behalf of Respondent No. 1-University of Delhi that the requirement of submission of valid Disability Certificate in the prescribed format was already stipulated in CSAS and the Bulletin and was not a newly introduced requirement. However, the Appellant failed to comply with the same. It was further submitted that permitting the candidate to appear in CUET did not create a vested right to admission giving rise to a legitimate expectation as the admission was provisional and subject to the condition of fulfilling post-exam eligibility criteria. In support, reliance was placed on ***Sonam Rawat v. University of Delhi***, 2023 SCC OnLine Del 375, wherein it was held that the Bulletin of Information has the force of law and there is no estoppel against law and, therefore, there is no legitimate expectation or estoppel applicable.

12. It was also submitted on behalf of Respondent No. 1-University of Delhi that there was no discrimination as the requirement of Disability Certificate in a prescribed format was a uniform condition applicable to all PwBD candidates and it was not an unreasonable or disproportionate requirement as the doctrine of reasonable accommodation does not extend to relaxation of essential eligibility conditions.

13. We have carefully considered the submissions of the learned Counsel for the Parties. The Appellant was well aware about the requirement for submission of Disability Certificate as prescribed under the Bulletin since



07.03.2025. It was specifically notified that the Disability Certificate has to be in a prescribed format and if the same is issued after 01.06.2021, it must be as per the Gazette Notification No. 1736(E) dated 05.05.2021 issued by the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities and applied through the UDID Portal. The candidates were further put to notice that they must ensure that the Disability Certificate is in the name of the candidate and issued by recognized Government Hospital bearing the duly attested photograph of the candidate.

14. Further, CSAS clearly provided that the candidates belonging to various reserved categories, who do not have a valid certificate / document issued by respective issuing authority at the time of applying will not be considered for allocation in the relevant category as claimed. The CSAS also provided the format in which the disability certificate has to be issued by the concerned authority.

15. However, the documents submitted by the Appellant were not in the prescribed format as required by CSAS. Further, the Appellant did not apply for obtaining the Disability Certificate through the UDID Portal as required by the Bulletin until 11.07.2025. Hence, the delay in applying for the Disability Certificate by the Appellant cannot be attributed to Respondent No. 2-College as even though a longer time would have been granted to the Appellant, it would not have been possible for the Appellant to obtain the Disability Certificate within the required time.

16. Further, in absence of any provision in the Bulletin or CSAS for granting relaxation of the requirement to provide the Disability Certificate in the prescribed format or extension of the cut-off date to provide additional



time to the Appellant for obtaining valid Disability Certificate for establishing the relevant category claimed, no such relaxation or extension can be granted.

17. The learned Single Judge has rightly relied upon the decision in ***P. Nihal Srivastava Through its Natural Guardian P. Harish Babu v. Union of India***, 2024 SCC OnLine Del 3113, which held that the rules governing the examination are applicable to all students and if any relaxation is required to be made, the same has to find place in the rule. It is further held that Courts cannot be permitted to tweak the rule to suit personal exigencies and deal with the difficulties being faced by the individual students, even if those difficulties are not attributed to any fault on part of the students, as otherwise it would result in total anarchy.

18. The learned Single Judge has dealt with all the decisions relied upon by the Appellant in the Impugned Judgment by giving detailed reasons as to their inapplicability to the facts of the present case. We entirely agree with the analysis of the learned Single Judge in the Impugned Judgment as none of the judgments relied upon by the Appellant dealt with the facts similar to the present case where the Appellant was aware of the requirement for the admission since 07.03.2025, however, waited till 11.07.2025 for applying for the Disability Certificate through UDID Portal.

19. Accordingly, the requirement of providing the Disability Certificate by the Appellant within one day was not unreasonable as the Appellant despite being aware of the requirement since long, had failed to meet with the criteria for the admission.

20. It is a settled law that the Court cannot change the mandatory criteria for admission or introduce new timeline once the process has started for the admission as it would impact all the other candidates. As the Appellant failed



to provide the required document in the prescribed format, Respondent No. 2-College was entitled to cancel the admission and allot the seat to the candidate, who has provided the required documents.

21. Upon being asked as to the availability of the seat, the learned Counsel for Respondent No. 2-College submitted, on instructions, that no vacant seats are available that can be allotted to the Appellant.

22. In view of the above analysis, we do not find any merit in the present Appeal as the Impugned Judgment does not require any interference. Accordingly, the present Appeal along with the pending Applications stands dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

TEJAS KARIA, J

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

FEBRUARY 13, 2026

ap