

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. _____ OF 2020

Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India

IN THE MATTER OF:

Vishal Tripathi & Another ... Petitioners

VERSUS

Bar Council of India, & Others ... Respondents

**WRIT PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO DIRECT
THE RESPONDENTS TO NOT CONDUCT FINAL YEAR EXAMINATION**

To

The Hon'ble Chief Justice and his Companion Judges of the

Hon'ble High Court of Delhi at New Delhi

The Humble Petition of the

Petitioner above named

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

The humble petition of the petitioner abovenamed
most respectfully -

1. The Petitioners are Citizen of India having permanent residence at the address mentioned in the cause title herein above.
2. The Petitioners are filing the present writ petition before this Hon'ble Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.
3. The Petitioners have filed the instant petition before the Honourable High Court at New Delhi in order to address the issues faced the students from lower socio-economic class due to a direction given by Bar Council of India.
4. It is submitted that The Bar Council of India vide its communication dated 27.5.2020 (bearing letter No.BCI:D:1401/2020) read with the Press Release Dated 09.06.2020 has directed the Law Universities to conduct examination for the intermediate semester students after reopening of colleges/universities. It has also has directed the Law Universities to conduct examination for the final semester students in online mode or alternatively through any other appropriate method.

True copy of The Bar Council of India Notification dated 27.5.2020 (bearing letter No.BCI:D:1401/2020) is marked and annexed as **Annexure A** at page 44.

True copy of The Bar Council of India Notification Press Release Dated 09.06.2020 is marked and annexed as **Annexure B** at page 45.

5. It is submitted that the University of Delhi vide its notification dated 27.6.20 has decided to conduct an examination based on OBE (Open Book Examination) mode. The relevant extract of the notification:

“The basic guidelines as issued by examination branch on 14.05.2020 related with OBE mode of examinations shall be applicable for further rescheduled examinations.”

“The new date sheets for all UG and PG programmes including SOL and NCWEB of final semester/term/year examinations in OBE (Open Book Examination) mode shall be notified by examination branch on 03.07.2020 and examination will commence from 10.07.2020;”

True copy of the University of Delhi vide its notification dated 27.6.20 is marked and annexed as **Annexure C** at page 46.

6. It is submitted that the direction to conduct an examination has a disproportionate and adverse impact on the students who are being unable to follow classes in online mode for various reasons including but not limited to accessibility, remote locality, and affordability.
7. It is submitted that a sixteen-year-old student has committed suicide in Assam's Chirang district on 24th June 2020. The student of Class 10, who came from a very poor family, was troubled as he could not

take part in online classes and examinations conducted by his school as he did not have a smart phone. Speaking to media, Sudhakar Singh, Chirang's superintendent of police, said, "The boy's family was very poor. His mother had gone to Bangalore in search of work and his father didn't have any job. The boy needed a smart phone to take part in online classes but his father was not able to get him one."^{1 2}

3

8. It is submitted that a student named Shibani Kumari Sau has committed suicide after she failed to attend online classes in the absence of a computer or a smartphone. The incident took place in Nischinda area of Howrah district of West Bengal⁴.
9. It is submitted that a global study conducted for the year 2018 by Pew Research Centre, suggests that among the surveyed countries, ownership of smartphone is lowest in India, where only 24% report having a smartphone. (Page 4, Pew Research Center, February 2019, "Smartphone Ownership Is Growing Rapidly Around the World, but Not Always Equally")

¹See Newsarticle: <https://www.guwahatipius.com/daily-news/assam-unable-to-attend-online-classes-student-allegedly-commits-suicide> ,

² See Newsarticle: <http://www.uniindia.com/unable-to-attend-online-classes-student-commits-suicide-in-assam/east/news/2051601.html>

³ See Newsarticle: <https://m.dailyhunt.in/news/india/english/gplus+english-epaper-gpls/assam+unable+to+attend+online+classes+student+allegedly+commits+suicide-newsid-n193468052>

⁴ See Newsarticle: <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/kolkata/unable-to-attend-online-classes-girl-kills>
self/articleshow/76473056.cms#:~:text=HOWRAH%3A%20A%20Class%20X%20girl,Nischinda's%20Rajchandrapur%20on%20Thursday%20evening.

True copy of Research Paper titled "*Smartphone Ownership Is Growing Rapidly Around the World, but Not Always Equally*" dated 5.26.19 is marked and annexed as **Annexure D** at page 48 to 95.

10. It is submitted that a nationwide survey conducted by National Statistical Office, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India on Household Social Consumption: Education for the year 2017-18 shows that only 10.7% Percentage of households has a computer while 23.8 % households has an internet facility In India and the percentage goes down to 4.4 and 14.9 respectively in rural India (page A-74, Table 32.1).

True copy of Extract of Report titled "*Key Indicators of Household Social Consumption on Education in India* " is marked and annexed as **Annexure E** at page 95 to 96.

11. It is submitted that The Bar Council of India vide its communication dated 28.4.20 [bearing letter No.BCI:D:1373/2020 (Council)] has already taken cognizance of the digital divide that exists in our Society. The communication noted that:

"We should not forget that a large Strata of society here in India still have no drinking water in their vicinity unable to eat even two meals a day, while at the same time there is another strata of society which has access to private jets. There are so many Strata of people

*in between these two strata; some areas have no electricity, no schools and colleges. Yet it is among them some want to study law become a lawyer to serve his/her society and they go and seek admission in nearby centres of the legal education for perusing their dreams. **Such students' parents may be labourer or may be exceedingly poor or from lower middle class and they may have just somehow managed to pay the college fees and still have no possibility of having any computer and/or net connection at home for giving/imparting or making available any such technology to their children due to their limitations and/or due to lack of facilities in their vicinity.***

True copy of the The Bar Council of India vide its communication dated 28.4.20 [bearing letter No.BCI:D:1373/2020 (Council)] is marked and annexed as **Annexure F** at page 97 to 104.

12. It is submitted that your petitioner had an opportunity to discuss this issue with a principle of a law colleges. Details of the discussion is given below to throw some light on this issue:

Name: Dr. Sanjith M N.

Designation: Principal

College: S B R R Mahajana Law College, Mysore

Total Strength: 140 students

Attendance in online class: around 40 to 50 students

Reason: There are Various Reasons. Some students do not have financial capacity to afford smart phone, some students do not have access to internet, while some students reside in remote locality where the connectivity is not strong.

13. It is submitted that The Bar Council of India vide its communication dated 23.4.2020 [bearing letter BCI:D:1366/2020] Directed all the law universities and Centre of legal education to continue with holding online classes for students of law in the country. The communication noted that:

"Since computer education is a compulsory protocol as per Rule-9(a)(b) of Schedule-III of Rules of Legal Education-2008, every student is supposed to be computer savvy and capable to understand and follow the regime of online classes. Therefore, you all should note that our decision for online classes is now the decision through a unanimous resolution passed by

meeting of the Council through Video Conferencing/Social Media.”

True copy of the The Bar Council of India vide its communication dated 23.4.2020 [bearing letter BCI:D:1366/2020] is marked and annexed as **Annexure G** at page 105 to 106.

14. It is submitted that the Reasoning of Bar Council of India in directing continuation of online classes, is misplaced. Mere knowledge of computer is not sufficient to understand and follow the regime of online classes. The students must also have possession of computer in their home and/or access to internet in order to successfully take part in the process of digital education.
15. It is submitted that therefore the online/internet mode education which was adopted as an alternative soon after the shutdown of the educational institution was essentially limited to the rich and comfortable class of the society.
16. It is submitted that the preamble objective of equality travels through the vehicle of article 14, 15, and 16 of Indian Constitution. Article 15 and 16 are narrow in their scope and limited to certain specific situations, but whereas article 14 is broader and a general protection against the violation equality.
17. It is submitted that the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in ***Madhu v. Northern Railway [247 (2018) DLT 198]*** placed its reliance upon a Canadian supreme court judgement ***Andrews v Law***

Society of British Columbia [(1989) 1 S.C.R. 143] and held that: “the touchstone to examine the validity of an allegedly discriminatory action is whether or not the effect of the action has a disproportionate impact on a class of citizens.” and thereby read the doctrine of ‘Disparate Impact’ within the equality scheme of our constitution.

18. It is submitted that disparate Impact means the adverse effect of a practice or standard that is neutral and non-discriminatory in its intention but, nonetheless, disproportionately affects individuals having a disability or belonging to a particular group based on their age, ethnicity, race, or sex.
19. It is submitted that the Hon’ble Delhi High Court in ***Madhu v. Northern Railway [247 (2018) DLT 198]*** did not restrict the operation of this doctrine only to the instances of article 15 or 16 but intentionally extended it to cover class of citizens to confer a greater protection under article 14.
20. It is submitted that a detailed discussion on this can also be traced in His Lordship Justice Dr. D Y Chandrachud’s concurring view, in ***Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India(AIR 2018 SC 4321)*** , under the heading ***"E.1 Facial neutrality: through the looking glass (para 394 and 395)"*** where it was held that : “Thus, when an action has the effect of imposing burdens, obligations, or disadvantages on such individual or group not imposed upon others, or which withholds or limits access to opportunities, benefits, and

advantages available to other members of society, it would be suspect.”

21. It is submitted that The Bar Council of India’s direction to conduct the examination might appear to be a neutral academic standard on its face and non-discriminatory by its intention. However, on an in-depth investigation it would be realized that it has only become a new tool to indirectly discriminate against the students from the lower socio-economic section on the wrong side of the digital divide.
22. It is submitted that the students who are unable to follow the online mode of education for various reasons like affordability, accessibility, remote locality etc., would effectively be compelled to write examination on subjects which they were never taught and that will have a **disparate impact** on these students and will impose an extra burden, obligation, or disadvantage on such individuals who were already marginalized.
23. It is submitted that education is a right in our country, and internet is a privilege. Therefore, India as it stands today, cannot afford to evaluate its students based on education which is disseminated through internet.
24. It is submitted that the communication of the Bar Council of India dated 27th May, 2020 (bearing letter No.BCI:D:1401/2020) claimed that the resolution and guidelines are only, in the light of detailed guidelines issued by the University Grants Commission on

27.04.2020. However, the UGC Guidelines on Examinations and Academic Calendar for the Universities in View of COVID-19 Pandemic and Subsequent Lockdown notes that:

*"For intermediate semester/year students, in case the situation does not appear to be normal in view of COVID-19, in order to maintain "social distancing", safety and health of the students, **grading** of the students could be composite of 50% marks on the basis of the pattern of internal evaluation adopted by the universities and the remaining 50% marks can be awarded on the basis of performance in previous semester only (if available). The internal evaluation can be continuous evaluation, prelims, mid-semester, internal evaluation or whatever name is given for student progression. In the situations where previous semester or previous year marks are not available, particularly in the first year of annual pattern of examinations, 100% evaluation may be done on the basis of internal assessments."*

True copy of the the UGC Guidelines on Examinations and Academic Calendar for the Universities in View of COVID-19 Pandemic and Subsequent Lockdown Dated April 2020 is marked and annexed as **Annexure H** at page 107 to 118.

25. It is submitted that UGC recommended the use of this mechanism to confer grade and not merely to provisionally promote the students. Whereas the BCI direction has mandated an exam after reopening for the purpose of conferring grade and the UGC recommended mechanism can only be used for the purpose of promotion. This is an unreasonable deviation from the recommendation.
26. It is submitted that the only report regarding Examinations and Academic Calendar is the guidelines issued by the University Grants Commission on 27.04.2020. However, given the unprecedented outbreak of COVID 19 post 27.04.2020, the UGC Guidelines are outdated now and they are non-binding in nature.
27. It is submitted that the UGC guidelines recommended to conduct examination for intermediate semester from 16.07.2020 to 31.07.2020 and to adopt a 6-week pattern regular classes to compensate to loss of online classes. However as per the latest communication of the Honourable HRD minister Ramesh Pokhriyal, the colleges are not going to reopen until September, 2020 which might again get extended due to the unstoppable spread of COVID 19⁵.
28. It is submitted that in a health emergency situation like this there must be a uniform mandatory guideline on examination to all the universities across the country so that the similarly circumstanced

⁵ <https://www.indiatoday.in/education-today/news/story/schools-will-reopen-after-august-2020-hrd-minister-ramesh-pokhriyal-1686418-2020-06-07>

students are not treated unequally based on their region or field of study.

29. It is submitted that the Honourable Supreme Court in ***All India Council for Technical Education v. Surinder Kumar Dhawan and Ors. (AIR 2009 SC 2322 at para 15)*** while dealing with a pure question of academic policy relied upon ***Directorate of Film Festivals v. Gaurav Ashwin Jain (AIR 2007 SC 1640 at para 14)*** where the Honourable Supreme Court had held that:

“Courts do not and cannot act as Appellate Authorities examining the correctness, suitability and appropriateness of a policy. The scope of judicial review when examining a policy of the Government is to check whether it violates the fundamental rights of the citizens or is opposed to the provisions of the Constitution, or opposed to any statutory provision or manifestly arbitrary.”

30. It is submitted that it's not the wisdom or soundness of the policy, but the Legality of the policy, which is under question here. The direction by the Bar Council of India has violated right to equality of the students. Therefore, this honourable court has every reason to exercise judicial review over this matter.

Situation in Delhi University

31. **Unavailability of case material:** Compilation of suggested (and mostly abridged version of) case laws and articles in the form of a book for each subject, every semester. There are 6 semesters in 3 year LLB programme, with 5 subjects each semester. Students are provided separate case materials for each subject for that particular academic semester when semester commences and all professors use case material as primary teaching tool/study material. Law Faculty didn't distribute any case materials to the students of semester 2, 4 and 6 (from Jan-May, 2020) as they hadn't been printed. The notification for availability and collection of case material was released on June 1, 2020 by the University, at a time when no one could have possibly accessed them. Hence, the whole of this semester students were without their most primary reading material.
32. Soft copies of the same for the year 2020 was released in March sometime, when the lockdown had already begun. Hence, classes took place without even the updated soft copy of the case material.
33. **The timing of the lockdown:** The Delhi University announced suspension of physical classes and announced online classrooms while the University Mid-Semester break was going on. Most outstation students head home for this short break. Since lockdown followed soon after, it was impossible for those stuck in their

hometowns to get their class notes, textbooks and other reading materials obtained from jan-march 2020.

34. **Students without access to the online classes:** There are many students who didn't have the luxury of laptops, internet, good internet speed, laptops/phones compatible with advanced video-conferencing applications, electricity supply, a quiet space, privacy, conducive environment to attend online classes, access to printers and finances to get hard copies of the limited study material which was provided.
35. **Some teachers free riding:** Each centre (campus law centre, law centre 1, law centre 2) of faculty of law has 10-12 sections per batch of LLB. There are about 5-7 teachers teaching one subject to each batch. Hence, each section has a different set of 5 teachers (for 5 subjects) who teach them. While some teachers taught online using different platforms, some simply did not. Hence, most sections from each batch had one subject not being taught at all and only a very few being taught at length/in detail.
36. **Inconsistent mode of teaching-** The Delhi University doesn't have one/universal online platform where online classes could be conducted. Hence, professors who took online classes took it via various modes- for each subject, classes happened on diff online platforms. Each subject was being taught via a diff platform- Zoom,

Google classroom, whatsapp audio messages, voice notes on online drives etc. Hence, each student was required to have access to most of these platforms along with good internet speed to be able to smoothly shuttle between and attend classes. A lot of confusion prevailed, especially in the first 30-45 days about what medium to use and for everyone, who could access them, to get comfortable. Before classes could become systematic and the process less confusing, students were told that syllabus was completed.

37. **Sparse access to e-resources-** Students of Law Faculty generally study in the library. Majority of the students are unaware of the method to access resources online through Delhi University e-library and there is no mandatory formal training given to students to access these resources. Moreover, the access is only to a few journals and other online resources which doesn't include access to lexis nexis - the only possible source to access commentaries and textbooks from.
38. **Online 'open' book exam without books-** The three absolute essentials for law students of DU are: Case material, commentaries and reference/textbooks. There is no chance for students to procure case material from the college- all that they have is a soft copy of those. Commentaries is always either issued from or read in the library by the students. No one has access to commentaries right now unless they have their lawyer parents' library. Reference/textbooks are bought by a rich few and mostly accessed through the law faculty libraries. During this period of lockdown,

when classes haven't taken place, there is absolutely no possibility of studying/understanding of concepts without having access to commentaries and textbooks. In such scenario, exams hardly serve any purpose.

39. **The current method of online exam-** The pre-requisite to taking the final sem exam is having access to fast internet speed and a printer-scanner so as to download-print question paper from an overburdened server, write the paper in 2 hours, scan those sheets for which one needs to have a scanner or a photocopy-cyber shop close to the place of writing an exam and fast internet again upload scanned copy of answer sheets on the DU website, fill your details and submit them- all of this within one hour.
40. Basically, exams are a bad idea.
41. The alternative is to not have examinations at all and to take the average of the students' grades/marks over the previous semesters and confer grade/marks on the basis of this average. This has been done in the case of the CBSE examination where the notification dated 25.6.20 (at Annexure F hereto) was issued in the context of students doing some examinations and missing the rest because of the lockdown. The circular states that for the remaining examinations:

"For the Students who have appeared in more than 3 subjects, average marks obtained in the

best three performing subjects will be awarded in the subjects whose examination have not been conducted”

True copy of the CBSE notification dated 25.6.2020 is marked and annexed as **Annexure I** at pages 119 to 121.

42. It is submitted that the writ has been filed under extreme exigencies and it requires urgent hearing of the matter.
43. The Petitioner has not presented any other Writ Petition before this Hon'ble Court or any other Forum on the same cause of action. The petitioner has already communicated these concerns to the Respondents via email dated 13.6.2020. The petitioner has not received any response from the respondent.

True copy of the Petitioner's email dated 13.6.2020 to Respondents is marked and annexed as **Annexure J** at pages 122.

44. The Petitioner, having no other efficacious or alternate remedy, has approached this Hon'ble Court by presenting this Writ Petition as a Public Interest Litigation under Article 226 of the Constitution on the following among other grounds:

GROUNDS

- I. For that the BCI direction to conduct examination has a disproportionate and adverse impact on the students who are being unable to follow classes in online mode for various reasons including but not limited to accessibility, remote locality, and affordability.
- II. For that a global study conducted for the year 2018 by Pew Research Centre, suggests that among the surveyed countries, ownership of smartphone is lowest in India, where only 24% report having a smartphone. (Page 4, Pew Research Center, February 2019, "Smartphone Ownership Is Growing Rapidly Around the World, but Not Always Equally")
- III. For that a nationwide survey conducted by National Statistical Office, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India on Household Social Consumption: Education for the year 2017-18 shows that only 10.7 % Percentage of households has a computer while 23.8 % households has an internet facility In India and the percentage goes down to 4.4 and 14.9 respectively in rural India. (page A-74, Table 32.1)
- IV. For that the Bar Council of India itself vide its communication dated 28th of April, 2020 [bearing letter No.BCI:D:1373/2020

(Council)] has already taken cognizance of the digital divide that exists in our Society. The communication noted that:

*"We should not forget that a large Strata of society here in India still have no drinking water in their vicinity unable to eat even two meals a day, while at the same time there is another strata of society which has access to private jets. There are so many Strata of people in between these two strata; some areas have no electricity, no schools and colleges. Yet it is among them some want to study law become a lawyer to serve his/her society and they go and seek admission in nearby centres of the legal education for perusing their dreams. **Such students' parents may be labourer or may be exceedingly poor or from lower middle class and they may have just somehow managed to pay the college fees and still have no possibility of having any computer and/or net connection at home for giving/imparting or making available any such technology to their children due to their limitations and/or due to lack of facilities in their vicinity.**"*

- V. For that the Reasoning of Bar Council of India in directing continuation of online classes, is misplaced. Mere knowledge of computer is not sufficient to understand and follow the regime of online classes. The students must also have possession of computer in their home and/or access to internet in order to successfully take part in the process of digital education.
- VI. For that therefore the online/internet mode education which was adopted as an alternative soon after the shutdown of the educational institution was essentially limited to the rich and comfortable class of the society.
- VII. For that the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in ***Madhu v. Northern Railway [247 (2018) DLT 198]*** placed its reliance upon a Canadian supreme court judgement ***Andrews v Law Society of British Columbia [(1989) 1 S.C.R. 143]*** and held that: "the touchstone to examine the validity of an allegedly discriminatory action is whether or not the effect of the action has a disproportionate impact on a class of citizens." and thereby read the doctrine of 'Disparate Impact' within the equality scheme of our constitution.
- VIII. For that the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in ***Madhu v. Northern Railway [247 (2018) DLT 198]*** did not restrict the operation of this doctrine only to the instances of article 15 or 16 but

intentionally extended it to cover class of citizens to confer a greater protection under article 14.

- IX. For that a detailed discussion on this can also be traced in His Lordship Justice Dr. D Y Chandrachud's concurring view, in ***Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India (AIR 2018 SC 4321)***, under the heading "***E.1 Facial neutrality: through the looking glass (para 394 and 395)***" where it was held that :
"Thus, when an action has the effect of imposing burdens, obligations, or disadvantages on such individual or group not imposed upon others, or which withholds or limits access to opportunities, benefits, and advantages available to other members of society, it would be suspect."
- X. For that the Bar Council of India's direction to conduct the examination might appear to be a neutral academic standard on its face and non-discriminatory by its intention. However on an in-depth investigation it would be realized that it has only become a new tool to indirectly discriminate against the students from the lower socio-economic section on the wrong side of the digital divide.
- XI. For that the students who are unable to follow the online mode of education for various reasons like affordability, accessibility, remote locality etc., would effectively be compelled to write examination on subjects which they were never taught and that

will have a **disparate impact** on these students and will impose an extra burden, obligation, or disadvantage on such individuals who were already marginalized.

XII. For that education is a right in our country, and internet is a privilege. Therefore, India as it stands today, cannot afford to evaluate its students based on education which is disseminated through internet.

XIII. For that UGC recommended the use of "50% internal assessment - 50% previous semesters marks mechanism" to confer grade and not merely to provisionally promote the students. Whereas the BCI direction has mandated an exam after reopening for the purpose of conferring grade and the UGC recommended mechanism can only be used for the purpose of promotion. This is an unreasonable deviation from the recommendation since it limits the discretion of the universities/colleges to adopt a case to case approach through internal assessment.

XIV. For that the only report regarding Examinations and Academic Calendar is the guideline issued by the University Grants Commission on 27.04.2020. However, given the unprecedented outbreak of COVID 19 post 27.04.2020, the UGC Guidelines are outdated now.

XV. It is submitted that the UGC guidelines recommended to conduct examination for intermediate semester from 16.07.2020 to

31.07.2020 and to adopt a 6-week pattern regular classes to compensate to loss of online classes. However as per the latest communication of the Honourable HRD minister Ramesh Pokhriyal, the colleges are not going to reopen until September, 2020 which might again get extended due to the unstoppable spread of COVID 19⁶. (Available at

XVI. For that in a health emergency situation like this the federal government or UGC must issue mandatory guidelines on examination policy to all the universities across the country so that the similarly circumstanced students are not treated unequally based on their region or field of study.

XVII. For that the Honourable Supreme Court in ***All India Council for Technical Education v. Surinder Kumar Dhawan and Ors. (AIR 2009 SC 2322 at para 15)*** while dealing with a pure question of academic policy relied upon ***Directorate of Film Festivals v. Gaurav Ashwin Jain (AIR 2007 SC 1640 at para 14)*** where the Honourable Supreme Court had held that:

“Courts do not and cannot act as Appellate Authorities examining the correctness, suitability and appropriateness of a policy. The scope of judicial review when examining

⁶ <https://www.indiatoday.in/education-today/news/story/schools-will-reopen-after-august-2020-hrd-minister-ramesh-pokhriyal-1686418-2020-06-07>

a policy of the Government is to check whether it violates the fundamental rights of the citizens or is opposed to the provisions of the Constitution, or opposed to any statutory provision or manifestly arbitrary.”

XVIII. For that it's not the wisdom or soundness of the policy, but the Legality of the policy, which is under question here. The direction by the Bar Council of India has violated right to equality of the students. Therefore, this honourable court has every reason to exercise judicial review over this matter.

PRAYERS

45. In the facts and circumstances stated herein above, it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court graciously be pleased to pass an order:

a) For a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction quashing the BCI Guidelines dated 27.5.20 and the BCI Press Release dated 9.6.20 and the University of Delhi Notification dated 27.6.20.

b) For an order directing an alternative system of evaluating the students to do complete justice to the

poorer section students and to exclude any possibility of discrimination and disadvantage.

AND FOR THIS ACT OF KINDNESS THE PETITIONER AS IN DUTY BOUND SHALL EVER PRAY

Filed by:

Date: 3.07.2020

Place: New Delhi

Mr. Gunjan Singh & Ms. Pragya Ganjoo

Advocate for the Petitioners

576, Masjid Road, Jangpura

New Delhi- 110 014

gunjanamu88@gmail.com |9643500529