



\$~79

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

+ **W.P.(C) 16200/2024**

AKASH JATAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arpit Bhargava, Mr. Sarthak Sharma, Mr. Abhishek Gaiind, Ms. Hina Bhargaa, Ms. Amrita Dhawan and Ms. Nitansha Gupta, Advocates.

versus

FACULTY OF TECHNOLOGY & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms. Yanmi Phazang and Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Advocates for University of Delhi.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

05.08.2025

1. After hearing learned counsels for both the parties, the controversy has narrowed down to the question as to whether petitioner, after he was allotted a seat in B.Tech (Computer Science and Engineering) during the process of upgradation in 8th round, accepted the allotment or he did not perform any activity, in terms of Clause 3.7.1 of Bulletin of Information.
2. Mr. Rupal contends that very fact the petitioner participated in spot counselling round shows that he had not retained a seat in any of the courses, which position is disputed by Mr Bhargava, learned counsel for petitioner. He submits in case petitioner did not accept the upgraded seat, he would retain the earlier seat in terms of clarification given in Clause 3.7.1 of the information bulletin.



3. Let Mr. Rupal file short affidavit along with a material to suggest that petitioner did not accept the allocation of seat in B.Tech (Computer Science and Engineering). Further, it may also be disclosed in the affidavit as to why petitioner was permitted to participate in the spot counselling round in case he had gone out of allocation process according to the respondents, after not having accepted the B.Tech (Computer Science and Engineering).
4. Re-notify on 18.08.2025.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

AUGUST 5, 2025/jg