

**Anup Razdan (Dr.) Vs. Union of India**

**Anup Razdan (Dr.) Vs. Union of India**

**SooperKanoon Citation :** [sooperkanoon.com/681947](http://sooperkanoon.com/681947)

**Court :** Delhi

**Decided On :** Jul-15-1998

**Reported in :** 1998VAD(Delhi)18; 74(1998)DLT627; 1998(46)DRJ336

**Judge :** K. Ramamoorthy, J.

**Acts :** [Constitution of India, 1950](#) - Article 226

**Appeal No. :** C.W. No. 4782/97 and CM Nos 8855/97 and 461/98

**Appellant :** Anup Razdan (Dr.)

**Respondent :** Union of India

**Advocate for Def. :** Mr. Rakesh Tikku, ; Mr. Vinay Bhasin, ; Mr. Shayam Babu

**Advocate for Pet/Ap. :** Mr. Prashant Bhushan, Adv

**Judgement :**

ORDER

**K. Ramamoorthy, J.**

1. The petitioner has prayed for quashing the nomination of respondents 3 to 6 for the MDS course against the seats reserved for Central Government nominees at King George Medical College, Lucknow for the Academic Year 1995-96. The writ petition was instituted on 10.11.1997. The case of the petitioner shortly stated is

that Respondents 3 to 6 were not qualified to be nominated and they have allotted seat on extraneous consideration. The selection of the candidates made by preparing the merit list and nomination of the candidates and the allotment of specialised made in the order of merits. The petitioner is very much lower down in the list of selected candidates and therefore, she cannot claim any right to be nominated. The petitioner has no locus standi to maintain the writ petition

2. Mr. Prashant Bhushan, the learned counsel for the petitioner raised several contentions relating to the nominations of the candidates from Delhi, when there is a college at Delhi, namely, All India Medical Institute of Science and other points. In view of the fact that the petitioner is very much lower down in the list of selected candidates. Even if the case of the petitioner is accepted with reference to respondents 3 to 6, the petitioner cannot claim to be selected and nominated for the college at King George Medical College, Lucknow.

3. Respondents 3 to 6 are fully qualified and no case has been made out by the petitioner to substantiate the point that respondents 3 to 6 are not qualified and their nomination and selection made is not in accordance with law.

4. In this view of the matter, I do not deem it necessary to consider other points raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner and the writ petition is dismissed.