

\$~ Writ-3

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

+ W.P.(C)No.3082/2020 & CM No.10716/2020

NISHANT KHATRI

..... Petitioner

Through : Dr. Subhash Vijayran, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through : Mr. H.V. Shankar, Standing Counsel
with Ms. Aakanksha Kaul, Adv. for
UOI.

Ms. Monika Arora, Standing Counsel
for R-2/JNU.

ORDER

% **11.05.2020**

[Court hearing convened *via* video-conferencing on account of COVID-19]

1. The principal grievance of the petitioner is that respondent No.2 is providing 27% reservation to the candidates belonging to Other Backward Classes [in short “OBC”] *qua* its postgraduate courses contrary to the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Ashoka Kumar Thakur vs. Union of India***, (2008) 6 SCC 1.

2. In support of this grievance, counsel for the petitioner has read out some observations made in the aforementioned judgement.

3. Mr. H.V. Shankar and Ms. Aakanksha Kaul, who appears on behalf of respondent No. 1, and Ms. Monika Arora, who appears on behalf of respondent No. 2, say that the petitioner is misreading and misconstruing the aforementioned judgment of the Supreme Court.
4. I will examine the matter further once affidavit(s)-in-reply are filed by the respondents.
5. In these circumstances, the respondents are directed to file a short-affidavit confined to the aforementioned aspect of the matter.
 - 5.1 The affidavit(s)-in-reply will be filed within two weeks.
 - 5.2 Rejoinder(s) thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.
6. Renotify the matter on 08.06.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 11, 2020/aj/kk

Click here to check corrigendum, if any