
(1989) 05 SC CK 0016

In the Supreme Court Of India

Case No : Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1050 of 1986

Meenakshi Malik

APPELLANT

Vs

University of Delhi and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 01-05-1989

Acts Referred:

Citation : AIR 1989 SC 1568 : (1989) JT 162 Supp : (1989) 2 SCALE 1153 : (1989) 1 SCALE 1153 : (1989) 3 SCC 112 : (1989) 2 SCR 858 : (1989) 2 UJ 208

Hon'ble Judges : R. S. Pathak, C.J.;Ranganath Misra, J;M. M. Dutt, J

Bench : Full Bench

Advocate : A.C. Gulati, S. K.Goel, S. K. Bansal and L.C. Goyal, for the Appellant; T.S. Krishnamurthy Iyer, Senior Advocate, Mariarputham, A. Mathur, M. Veerappa, Pramod Swarup, K. Ramkumar, R. Bana, A. Subba Rao, S. K. Bhattacharya, Urmila Kapoor and Janki, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

R.S. Pathak, C.J.—On 31 July, 1987, we allowed this writ petition and directed the respondents to admit the petitioner, Meenakshi Malik, in one of the three Delhi Medical Colleges in the first year course prescribed for the M.B.B.S. Degree. We said that the reasons would be pronounced later. We proceed to do so now.

2. The petitioner was born in Delhi on 8 September, 1967. Her father, Shri O.P. Malik, was employed in the National Council of Educational Research and Training, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi and her mother, Smt. Kanta Devi Malik was employed in the Government Girls Senior Secondary School, Mehrauli, New Delhi. The petitioner attended the Junior Public School, Shakti Nagar, up to Class II and the Cambridge School, Siriniwasपुरी, New Delhi, up to Class IX until 19 January, 1982. The petitioner's father was placed on deputation in January, 1982 with the Government of Nigeria to serve in its Ministry of Education through the Ministry of Home Affairs, Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms, Government of India, New Delhi. The petitioner, who was a minor at the time,

had to accompany her parents along with her minor brother. In Nigeria, the petitioner continued her education as an Overseas candidate and appeared for the examination conducted by the University of London in Kanduna, Nigeria, and she passed the General Certificate of Education Ordinary level (GCE-'O' level) which is recognised by the Central Board of Secondary Education, New Delhi, as equivalent to Class XI in India.

3. On completing the period of his deputation on 8 April, 1984 the petitioner's father returned to India with his family. The petitioner was admitted to Class XII in the Delhi Public School, Mathura Road, New, Delhi. The Central Board of Secondary Education permitted her admission to that Class. The petitioner appeared in the All India Senior School Certificate Examination conducted by the Central Board of Secondary Education, New Delhi, in March, 1985 and passed the examination. The petitioner then sat for the Entrance Examination for admission to one of the three Medical Colleges in Delhi, and she obtained 750 marks. The candidates who obtained an equal number of marks or even less were granted admission, but the petitioner was denied admission. She fell for consideration in the quota of seventy per cent of the seats reserved for candidates who had passed the qualifying examination I from the University of Delhi or the Central Board of Secondary Education or the Council for the Indian School Certificate Examination from recognised schools conducting regular classes in the Union Territory of Delhi. But she was denied admission because she had not satisfied the further condition that the last two years of education should be had in a school in Delhi. Aggrieved by the denial of admission, the petitioner filed the present writ petition.

4. It seems to us that the qualifying, condition that a candidate appearing for the Entrance Examination for admission to a Medical College in Delhi should have received the last two years of education in a school in Delhi is unreasonable when applied in the case of those candidates who were compelled to leave India for a foreign country by reason of the posting of the parent by the Government to such foreign country. There is no real choice in the matter for such a, student, and in many cases the circumstances of the student do not permit her to continue schooling in India. It is, of course, theoretically : possible for a student to be put into a hostel to continue her schooling in Delhi. But in many cases this may not be feasible and the student must accompany a parent to the foreign country. It appears to us that the rigour of the condition prescribing that the last two years of education should be received in a school in Delhi should be relaxed, and there should be no insistence on the fulfilment of that condition, in the case of students of parents who are transferred to a foreign country by the Government and who are therefore required to leave India along with them. Rules are intended to be reasonable, and should take into account the variety of circumstances in which those whom the rules seek to govern find themselves. We are of opinion that the condition in the prescription of qualifications for admission to a medical college in Delhi providing that the last two years of education should be in a school in Delhi should be construed as not applicable to

students who have to leave India with their parents on the parent being posted to a foreign country by the Government.

5. Accordingly, the denial of admission to the petitioner to a seat in one of the Medical Colleges in Delhi must be held to be unreasonable. It is not disputed that if the condition of schooling for the last two years in a school in Delhi is removed from the way the petitioner would be entitled to admission in a Medical College in Delhi. In the circumstances, the petitioner is entitled to an order directing the respondent to admit her to one of the Medical Colleges in Delhi.