



\$~91

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9467/2025**

VEDANSHI PAHUJA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rohan Bhambri, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Aarushi Tikku, Adv for R-6/MCD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

10.07.2025

CM APPL. 39978/2025 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 9467/2025 & CM APPL. 39977/2025 (stay)

3. The present petition has been filed seeking following relief:

“a. Issue of a Writ of certiorari/mandamus directing Respondent No.1 (IIM Indore) to conduct a re-examination or alternate examination for the Petitioners and similarly placed candidates who were denied entry into the IPM Aptitude Test (AT) 2025 at Pawan Ganga Educational Centre and/or;

b. Issue a writ of certiorari quashing any part of the IPM-AT 2025 result which excludes Petitioners due to nonappearance resulting from the said denial and/or;

c. Issue directions to the Ministry of Education and



Department of Higher Education to conduct a judicial or quasi-judicial inquiry into the events leading to the denial of entry and fix responsibility upon erring officials and/or;

d. Issue a writ of mandamus directing the Government of NCT of Delhi and Delhi Police to frame binding Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for examination day traffic and public coordination in future and/or; ”

4. The case set out by the petitioner in the writ petition is that the petitioners are the students who have passed class XII and aspired for career in management from IIM, Indore and accordingly, they had applied for the entrance examination.
5. The respondent no. 4 had issued admit card to the petitioners which clearly mentions the reporting time between 12:00 PM to 01:30 PM.
6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that the petitioners had reached the examination centre prior to 01:30 PM but still they were not allowed to enter the examination hall and take their exam. He submits that the petitioners were not permitted to enter the examination hall on the pretext that they have reported late.
7. He submits that the petitioner could not make it to the examination centre at the earliest due to unprecedented and unmanaged traffic congestion. He contends that a legal notice has also been sent by the petitioners to the Delhi Traffic Police and the response received from the Delhi Traffic Police suggests that there is a clear admission on part of the traffic police that there was a congestion in the area and traffic police had notified with regard to the same to the examination centre as well.
8. The response received from the traffic police has been handed over across the Bar and the same is taken on record.



9. In view of the above, issue notice by all permissible modes to the respondents.
10. Ms. Aarushi Tiku, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no. 6 accepts notice.
11. On petitioner taking steps, issue notice to respondent nos. 1-5 by all permissible modes.
12. Let counter affidavit be filed within a period of two weeks.
13. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within a period of one week thereafter.
14. Re-notify on 06.08.2025.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

JULY 10, 2025

bs