



\$~71

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

% **Date of Decision: 09.09.2025**

+ **W.P.(C) 13166/2025 & CM APPL. 55623/2025**

ROHIT SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Davinder Pal Kaur, Mr. Sachin Shukla, Mr. Harpreet Singh, Advocates

versus

DELHI UNIVERSITY & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Mr. Vibhu Sharma, Advocates (M:6397742516)

Dr. Monika Arora, Standing Counsel with Mr. Subhrodeep Saha, Ms. Anamika Thakur, Mr. Prabhat Kumar, Mr. Abhinav Verma, Advocates for R-2 (M:8882173375)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

MINI PUSHKARNA, J. (ORAL)

1. The present writ petition has been filed praying for restraining respondent no. 4 from disqualifying the petitioner from taking part in the upcoming Delhi University Students' Union ("DUSU") Elections, and for directions to respondent no. 4 to consider the nomination of the petitioner for the same.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, while being a student of Hansraj College, Delhi University, was suspended for a period of six months *vide* Order dated 22nd March, 2023. It is submitted that



the petitioner has already graduated from the Hansraj College, Delhi University, and is now studying in another course at the Post Graduate Level.

3. Since the petitioner intends to contest in the DUSU Elections, the present writ petition has been filed.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner relies upon order dated 6th May, 2025 passed in *W.P.(C) 12613/2024*, titled as “*Aryan Maan Versus Delhi University and Ors*”, to submit that similar order be passed in the present case also.

5. Today, learned counsel appearing for respondent nos. 2 and 3, i.e., Hansraj College, submits that the suspension period of the petitioner was from 22nd March, 2023 till 12th September, 2023, and the same is long over. Therefore, at this stage, the petitioner cannot seek to challenge the said Order.

6. She further submits that the present writ petition has been filed without any cause of action and is premature, since the petitioner is yet to file any nomination for the DUSU Elections. She further submits that as far as the suspension period is concerned, the stand of the College is categorical to the effect that suspension of the petitioner is not a disciplinary action taken against him, but only a measure taken by the College to keep the petitioner away from mischief, during the enquiry.

7. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 1-University of Delhi submits that University of Delhi has objections, since the petitioner has already accepted his misconduct and misbehaviour.

8. He submits that a First Information Report (“FIR”) was lodged against the petitioner for misconduct and misbehaviour, and only upon the



petitioner giving an undertaking that the petitioner shall maintain peace and public tranquility, the petitioner was discharged from the Court of Special Executive Magistrate (“SEM”), North District, Delhi by order dated 21st June, 2023.

9. He, thus, submits that the present writ petition is distinct from the matter in *W.P.(C) 12613/2024*, titled as “*Aryan Maan Versus Delhi University and Ors*”.

10. Counter affidavit on behalf of the respondent no. 1-University of Delhi has been handed over, which is taken on record.

11. Responding to the aforesaid submission, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner draws the attention of this Court to the Order dated 21st June, 2023, passed by the Special Executive Magistrate, North District, Delhi, to submit that the order with respect to the petitioner was common with Aryan Maan, the petitioner in *W.P.(C) 12613/2024*. He, thus, submits that the case of the petitioner shall fall in the same category as that of Aryan Maan.

12. Having heard learned counsels for the parties, this Court notes the submission made on behalf of Hansraj College that the suspension of the petitioner would not be considered as a disciplinary action against the petitioner. Further, this Court notes the submissions made on behalf of the Hansraj College that the Lyngdoh Committee Recommendations also do not contemplate suspension as a criteria to disqualify a candidate from contesting the election.

13. Further, this Court also takes note of the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner that the case of the petitioner falls in the same category as in the case of Aryan Maan, i.e., *W.P.(C) 12613/2024*.



14. Considering the fact that the petitioner is yet to file his nomination for the DUSU Elections, and objection with regard thereto, is yet to be raised, it is directed that in case the petitioner files his nomination for the DUSU Elections, the University shall consider the case of the petitioner in view of the submissions as recorded in the present order.

15. The University will make its decision taking into account the applicable Rules.

16. It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

17. Rights and contentions of both the parties are left open.

18. Accordingly, noting the aforesaid, the present writ petition, along with pending application is disposed of.

19. Order *dasti* under the Signatures of the Court Master.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

SEPTEMBER 9, 2025/au