



\$~174

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 8114/2026**
AARAV DHAWAN MINOR THROUGH HIS FATHER AND
NATURAL GUARDIANPetitioner
Through: Mr Rishi Manchanda Mr Siddharth
Mullick, Advs
versus
GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Mohit Agarwal & Mr. Prerak
Khurana Advs for R1-2
Mrs Avnish Ahlawat SC NSUT, Mr Nitesh Kumar
Singh, Ms Aliza Alam, Advs. for R3

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

%

24.07.2026

CM APPL. 47233/2026

1. This is an application filed under Section 151 of CPC, 1908 seeking directions to respondent No. 3 to allocate a seat to the petitioner in Delhi Technical University (Computer Science and Engineering) Course during pendency of the present petition.
2. For the reasons stated in the application, issue notice.
3. Mr. Agarwal and Ms. Alam, learned counsels for the respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3, respectively.
4. The brief facts of the case are that the rank of the petitioner is 12,617 and as per Annexure C of the application it seems that respondent No.2 has offered Computer Science and Engineering to the rank of 14,806.
5. It is contended that the petitioner had duly registered before commencement of the second round of counselling and, as per the officially published closing ranks, seats in the Computer Science and Engineering



programme were allotted to candidates having ranks lower than that of the petitioner. It is, therefore, submitted that the petitioner has been illegally denied admission despite being eligible and despite specific directions issued by this Court.

6. I am of the view that the petitioner has a prima facie case, the record indicates that the petitioner complied with the directions contained in the order dated 25.06.2026 by physically registering himself for the counselling process and completing all requisite formalities.

7. It further appears that despite the subsequent order dated 10.07.2026 directing allotment of a seat to the petitioner in Delhi Technological University (Computer Science and Engineering), the said direction could not be effectuated. The balance of convenience also lies in favour of the petitioner. In the event interim relief is declined, the petitioner is likely to suffer irreparable injury, which cannot be adequately compensated at a later stage.

8. For the said reasons, the respondent No. 3 shall keep a seat vacant for the petitioner.

9. List on 03.08.2026.

JASMEET SINGH, J

JULY 24, 2026/AS