
(2008) 01 DEL CK 0241

In the Delhi High Court

Case No : Writ Petition (Civil) No. 502 of 2008

Sh. Prem Kumar Prasad

APPELLANT

Vs

Jamia Hamdard (Deemed University)

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 22-01-2008

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2008) 01 DEL CK 0241

Hon'ble Judges : Gita Mittal, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Sandeep Thakur, for the Appellant; None, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Gita Mittal, J.—This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner complaining that he had joined the B.B.A. Course of the Jamia Hamdard University in the year 2004. The petitioner has stated that he has passed the first and second year examination of the course in the year 2005-2006 respectively. However on account of illness he was unable to take the third year examination properly and failed the examination.

The grievance made in the writ petition is that as per the rules and regulations applicable, so far as the supplementary examination for failed students is concerned, the same is being conducted and scheduled by the respondent/university only alongwith the examinations of the next academic year. The petitioner's grievance is that the same impacts his valuable rights inasmuch as one whole year is caused to be wasted.

2. The rules and regulations which have been framed by the university were within the knowledge of the petitioner when he had taken admission to the course. It is trite that no student has any legal or enforceable right to claim that the supplementary examination or any other exam be conducted on a particular date or time as per the convenience of the candidate. Needless to say supplementary exams are intended and are organised by the university for the

purposes of enabling students who have failed in any examination a further opportunity to pass the same. A vigilant, conscious and diligent student would ensure that occasion to take such supplementary examination will not occur. Be that as it may, conduct of examinations entails costs and administrative organisation. Such considered decision resulting in a schedule being notified calls for no judicial interference. The petitioner has no right whatsoever to claim a mandamus or direction to issue to the respondents to hold the supplementary examination for him at a particular date and time. The respondents are best placed to fix such schedule.

For all these reasons I find no merit in this writ petition which is hereby dismissed.