



\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI*Date of Decision: 14th October, 2024*

+

**W.P.(CRL) 793/2017, CRL.M.As.13198/2017, 16639/2017,
3556/2018 & 8850/2024****COURTS ON ITS OWN MOTION IN RE: SUICIDE COMMITTED
BY SUSHANT ROHILLA, LAW STUDENT OF I.P. UNIVER**

.....Petitioner

**Through: Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Sr Adv. (Amicus
Curiae) with Mr. Sukrit Seth, Ms.
Aakashi Lodha, Mr. Sanjeevi Seshadri
& Mr. Shreedhar Kale, Advs. (M:
9871167778).**

versus

.....

.....Respondent

**Through: Mr. Chetan Sharma, ASG, Mr.
Kirtiman Singh, CGSC, Mr. Waize Ali
Noor, Mr. Varun Pratap Singh, Mr.
Maulik Khurana & Mr. Ranjeev
Khatana, Advs. for Union of India (M:
9871221149).****Ms. Nandita Rao, ASC (Crl.) for
GNCTD. Mr. T. Singhdev, Mr.
Abhijit Chakravarty, Mr. Tanishq
Srivastava, Mr. Sourabh Kumar, Mr.
Bhanu Gulati, Mr. Aabhaas
Sukhramani and Ms. Anum Hussain,
Advs for National Medical
Commission and Dental Council of
India (M: 9044153267).****Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with Mr.
Devvrat Yadav, Advocate for AICTE.
Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC NSUT with
Mr. Amitoj Chadha, Ms. Lavanya
Kaushik, Ms. Aliza Alam and Mr.
Mohnish Sehrawat, Advocates. (M:
8527074562)**



Mr. Pritish Sabharwal, Standing Counsel for Jamia Millia Islamia (M: 9871878690).

Mr. Raajan Chawla, Mr. Gautam Chauhan & Mr. Ashok Mahajan, Advs. for R-1 (M: 9871733347).

Mr. Honey Khanna & Mr. Shyam Singh, Advs for R-4 and 5 (M: 9899649343).

Mr. Atul Kumar, Ms. Sweety Singh, Mr. Rahul Pandey & Mr. Sudipta Singha Roy, Advs for AIIMS (M: 9818385222).

Ms. Monika Arora Advocate for R-13-IIMC (M: 9810246300).

Mr. Arjun Mitra, Adv. for R-14 & 15 (M: 9810412737)

Mr. Ankit Jain, Mr. Aditya Chauhan & Ms. Divyanshu Rathi, Advs., Advocates for Indian Law Institute (M: 8396996188).

Ms Bharathi Raju, Senior Panel Counsel for R-16 (M: 9868895906).

Mr. Siddharth Panda and Mr. Ritank Kumar Advs. for R-19 (M: 9891488088).

Mr. Mohinder JS Rupal Adv. for University of Delhi (M: 9811151216).

Mr. Hardik Rupal, Adv. for Jamia Hamdard University (M: 9811316090).

Mr. Neeraj Verma Advocate for R-24 (M: 9810762420).

Mr Joby P Varghese, Advocate.

Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari and Ms. Mrinaal Kishor, Advocates for R-27 (M: 7503397704).

Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari



and Mrinal Kishor, Advocates for R-28 (M: 7503397704).

Mr. Vibhakar Mishra, Advocate for Shri Lal Bahadur Sashtri University (M: 9810092597).

Mr. Ankit Jain and Ms. Divyanshu Rathi, Advs. for ILI (M: 8396996188).

Mr. Raajan Chawla and Ms. Yashi Singh, Advs. for Amity law school.

Ms. Pragya Parijat Singh and Mr. Lakshay Saini, Advs. for R-32, (M: 9999705006)

Ms. Anju Bhushan Gupta, Mr. Aditya Goel and Mr. Sanjay Gupta, Advs. for R-33.

Mr. Yashvardhan, Ms. Kritika Nagpal, Mr. Gyanendra Shukla and Mr. Pranav Das, Advocates for DPSRU.

Mr. Keshav Datta, Advocate, Intervener (M: 9871919591).

Mr. Vibhakar Mishra, Advocate for Lal Bahadur Central Sanskrit University (M: 9810092597).

Mr. Preet Pal Singh, Mrs. Tanupreet Kaur, Ms. Simrat Kaur, Ms. Akanksha Singh, Mr. Madhukar Pandey & Mr. Unmukt Bhardwaj, Advocates for Bar Council of India (M: 8800848307).

Ms. Ginny J Rautray, Mr. Navdeep Singh, Ms. Devika Thakur & Mr. Ranvijay Singh, Advs. for R-12 & 22 (M: 9811287117)

CORAM:
JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

Prathiba M. Singh, J. (Oral)

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.



2. A short note dated 14th October, 2024 has been placed by Mr. Kirtiman Singh, Ld. CGSC on behalf of the Union of India (Ministry of Education, Department of Higher Education) stating as under:-

“1. The Answering Respondent is presenting this Short Note in compliance to the directions of this Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 09.09.2024. This Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 09.09.2024 inter alia directed the Answering Respondent Ministry of Education, Department of Higher Education as under:

- i. To issue a circular across the country to all educational institutions at undergraduate and postgraduate levels to constitute their Grievance Redressal Committee within two weeks;*
- ii. To commence a stakeholder consultation on the question as to whether attendance norms ought to be made mandatory in undergraduate and postgraduate courses.*

This Hon'ble Court had also listed various factors to be considered during the stakeholder consultation.

2. It is respectfully submitted that in compliance with the directions of this Hon'ble Court, the University Grants Commission vide its letter dated 19.09.2024 directed all the Higher Educational Institutes to take immediate steps to constitute Students' Grievance Redressal Committee(s) (SGRCS) as provided in the University Grants Commission (Redressal of Grievances of Students) Regulations, 2023 notified on 11.04.2023. The Colleges are required to furnish the details of SGRCS constituted by them to their affiliating Universities. Consequently, the Universities are required to furnish the details of the SGRC constituted by them and by their affiliated institutions by 24.09.2024 in the prescribed format. The Copy of the letter dated 19.09.2024 by UGC to all the Higher Educational Institutes is marked and annexed herewith as Annexure 1.

3. It is further respectfully submitted that the Answering Respondent (Department of Higher Education) has sought comments from HEIs on 20



points mentioned in the order dated 09.09.2024 by this Hon'ble Court, the said comments are being collected and compiled.

4. It is respectfully submitted that the first consultation meeting was held on 07.10.2024 with all the Statutory Councils/Bodies in the matter along with the UGC and the AICTE.”

3. The said short note does not capture the outcome of the consultation meeting which was held on 7th October, 2024 with all the Statutory Councils/Bodies in the matter along with the University Grants Commission ('UGC') and the All India Council for Technical Education ('AICTE'). The said also does not include the list of Higher Educational Institutions to whom the circular dated 19th September, 2024 has been issued by the Secretary, UGC for the constitution of the Grievance Redressal Committee for Students in Higher Education Institutions.

4. Let a proper affidavit be filed on behalf of the Department of Higher Education giving the complete details of the list of the institutions to whom the letter dated 19th September, 2024 has been issued by the Secretary, UGC. In the said list, all the institutions whose responses have been received shall also be reflected.

5. The outcome of the consultation meeting held on 7th October, 2024 which may be in the form of the minutes of meeting shall also be placed on record. If no minutes of the said meeting have been drawn, the outcome of the said consultation meeting shall also be captured in the said affidavit on behalf of Department of Higher Education.

6. Insofar as the direction contained in Paragraph 33 of the order dated 9th September, 2024 is concerned, Mr. Ashok Mahajan has appeared today on



behalf of the Respondent no.1, and has made various submissions on merits to argue that Amity Law School, Delhi was not at fault. Mr. Mahajan has placed before the Court the profile of the University and the large number of students to whom education is imparted both in India and in some foreign countries. It is further argued that the University also gives scholarships to several deserving students. Specifically in respect of the student – Mr. Rohilla, it is submitted that the parents were duly notified from time to time regarding the shortage of attendance. Thus, the institution cannot be blamed for what was an unfortunate turn of events.

7. Be that as it may, the entire purpose of Paragraph 33 of the said order was to seek instructions as to whether Respondent No. 1 was willing to make *ex-gratia* compensation to the family of the deceased who passed away. On this issue, Mr. Ashok Mahajan, Id. Counsel again seeks time to take instructions and revert by the next date of hearing.

8. On behalf of the Bar Council of India, Mr. Preet Pal Singh has placed before the Court a document consisting the constitution of the Legal Education Committee of the Bar Council of India and Attendance Requirements of Various International Universities.

9. The present case relates to attendance requirements prescribed for the LL.B. degree (five year course) which is prescribed by the Bar Council of India. Accordingly, let the Legal Education Committee of the Bar Council of India hold a meeting and place its stand before the Court in respect of the attendance requirements after considering the prevalent requirements for attendance and also the factors set out in Paragraph 32(b) of the order dated 9th September, 2024. Considering the constitution of the Legal Education Committee, the Bar Council of India may hold a virtual meeting for the



purpose of finalising its position in this regard. Let an affidavit be filed in respect of the same within two weeks.

10. Let the affidavit on behalf of the Union of India, Respondent no.1 Amity, and any other party who wishes to file an affidavit, be filed within two weeks for the purpose of further directions.

11. Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Ld. Senior Counsel submits that there have been further recent unfortunate incidents of suicides in different institutions and he thus prays that he may be permitted to place a note to expand the scope of the consultation. In this regard, let the note be placed on record by the Ld. *Amicus Curiae*.

12. List for hearing on 6th November, 2024.

13. This is a part-heard matter.

**PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUDGE**

**AMIT SHARMA
JUDGE**

OCTOBER 14, 2024/kr/sc