

declared in view of other interim orders passed by the High Court.

Shri Pallav Sisodia, learned senior counsel appearing for respondent No.1 submitted that the students, whose result was declared by the University had been admitted in May, 2009 and therefore, the interim order passed by this Court did not impede declaration of their result. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not disputed this statement but submitted that the University was not justified in declaring the result ignoring the fact that legality and correctness of the order passed by the High Court was pending consideration before this Court.

In our view, it is not possible to castigate the University for having declared the result of the students who were admitted in May, 2009 because this

3

Court had passed interim order only on 22.7.2009. That apart, once the result of the students has been declared, we do not consider it necessary to decide the questions raised in the special leave petition and feel that ends of justice will be met by requesting the High Court to dispose of the main petition at the earliest.

The special leave petition is accordingly disposed of.

However, it is made clear that the order under challenge shall not be construed as precedent for any purpose whatsoever.

(A.D. Sharma)
Court Master

(Phoolan Wati Arora)
Court Master