



न्यायालय मुख्य आयुक्त दिव्यांगजन

COURT OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (DIVYANGJAN)
 दिव्यांगजन सशक्तिकरण विभाग/Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (Divyangjan)
 सामाजिक न्याय और अधिकारिता मंत्रालय/Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment
 भारत सरकार/Government of India
 5वाँ तल, एन.आई.एस.डी. भवन, जी-2, सेक्टर-10, द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075; दूरभाष : (011) 20892364
 5th Floor, N.I.S.D. Bhawan, G-2, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075; Tel.: (011) 20892364
 Email: ccpd@nic.in; Website: www.ccdisabilities.nic.in

In the Tagged Matters of

Case No: 15758/1032/2024

Complainant

Mx. Anushka Priyadarshini

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Registrar, University of Delhi (registrar@du.ac.in) ... (1)

The Principal, Miranda House, University of Delhi
 (principal@mirandahouse.ac.in) ... (2)

Diary No: DNO/25/CCPD/4841

Complainant

Mx. Anushka Priyadarshini

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Provost, Undergraduate Hostel for Girls ... (1)

The Registrar, University of Delhi (registrar@du.ac.in) ... (2)

1. Gist of the Proceedings (15758/1032/2024)

1.1 The Complainant, Ms. Anushka Priyadarshini, a student with a certified 48% intellectual disability enrolled in the B.A. L.L.B. Programme (Roll No. 2024/142) at Miranda House, University of Delhi, has filed a grievance before the CCPD against the university's Registrar and the college Principal regarding the repeated denial of hostel accommodation. The Complainant asserts that despite securing an exceptional All India Rank 10 in the PwBD category for CLAT 2025 and qualifying in the first admission round, her name was deliberately excluded from the hostel interview lists in favour of candidates with vastly lower merit scores. Coming from an economically disadvantaged background, the Complainant highlights that private accommodations are unaffordable and notes that as a transgender/intersex student with a Disorders of Sex Development (DSD) condition, she faces systemic housing discrimination and severe public infrastructure barriers. She alleges facing systemic harassment and profiling on campus, including being forced to undergo identity verification three times on orientation day, while the college administration maintained complete silence on her written requests despite leaving two reserved PwBD seats and five discretionary hostel seats vacant.

1.2 Seeking the Court's intervention, the Complainant points out that this administrative non-responsiveness and hostile environment ultimately left her feeling forced to discontinue from regular classes and register for distance learning through IGNOU, effectively resulting in a constructive denial of her education. She requests immediate allocation of a vacant reserved or discretionary hostel seat at Miranda House, a formal written apology from the principal for discriminatory treatment, a transparency review of the hostel's allotment procedures, and legal protection against institutional retaliation, arguing that the college's failure to provide necessary support violates her fundamental rights under Articles 14, 19(1) (a), and 21 of the Indian Constitution.

1.3 The matter was taken up with the Respondent vide notice dated 24.09.2024 citing provisions u/s 3, 21, 23, and 75(1) (a) and (b) of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. Consequent to the absence of any response from the Respondent, a first reminder dated 24.11.2024 was duly issued to the Respondent, calling upon them to submit their reply. The Court noted with grave concern that even after the issuance of the said reminder, no written response, explanation, or defensive submission was filed by the Respondent, demonstrating a persistent administrative negligence and a complete disregard for the statutory notices issued by this quasi-judicial authority.

1.4 A hearing was conducted on 26.09.2025 in Hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Mx. Anushka Priyadarshini	Complainant
2.	Adv. Parv Garg	Respondent 1
3.	Prof Bipin Tiwary	Respondent 1
4.	Adv. Mohinder Rupal	Respondent 2

1.5 During the proceedings, the Complainant, Mx. Anushka Priyadarshini, appearing in person, reiterated her grievance regarding the persistent and discriminatory denial of hostel accommodation at Miranda House. The Complainant emphasized that as an outstation student from an economically weaker background with a certified 48% intellectual disability, affordable campus housing is an indispensable statutory necessity under the RPwD Act, 2016. She submitted that the college administration's refusal to allot her a seat from the vacant reserved quota and their hostile handling of her identity verification on orientation day forced her to abandon regular classes and seek refuge in distance learning through IGNOU, effectively resulting in a constructive denial of her regular higher education.

1.6 The Respondent, Miranda House, represented by Advocate Mohinder Rupal, countered that the Complainant was admitted for the academic year 2024–25 based on a self-declaration identifying as female, but contended that the college was never formally apprised of her complete gender details, noting that Miranda House is an exclusively women's institution. The Respondent submitted a detailed compliance report and stated that out of 129 available first-year hostel seats, 5% were strictly reserved for the PwBD category; however, due to high demand, the college follows an internal prioritization policy favouring students with severe visual and locomotor disabilities over intellectual disabilities. The Respondent further asserted that the Complainant had failed to attend a single regular lecture, internal assessment, or proctorial committee meeting, thereby legally changing her status to an ex-student and rendering her current request for hostel accommodation entirely infructuous.

1.7 The Court observed that the academic session had advanced significantly

and noted that the Complainant had already altered her institutional position by enrolling in an open university system. The Court stated that while the college's implementation of a 5% statutory reservation policy represents an acceptable institutional framework, mere verbal assertions regarding compliance must be supported by verifiable documentary evidence. Concluding the hearing, the Court recommended the Respondents to submit a comprehensive Action Taken Report alongside definitive evidentiary proof of all their administrative practices within fifteen days, following which the final order of the Court would be issued.

1.8 The Court notes with severe displeasure that despite the advanced academic session and the Complainant's forced migration to an open university system, the Respondents completely failed to submit their Action Taken Report or provide verifiable documentary evidence within the stipulated fifteen-day timeline post-hearing.

2. Gist of the Proceedings (DNO/25/CCPD/4841)

2.1 A similar grievance was submitted to this Court by the Complainant, Mx. Anushka Priyadarshini, dated 02.10.2025, under Diary No: DNO/25/CCPD/4841, which was preliminarily heard on subsequent dates.

2.2 A hearing was conducted on 15.12.2025 in Hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Adv. Parv Garg	Respondent 2
2.	Prof Bipin Tiwary	Respondent 2

2.3 The Court observed that the Respondent university's argument regarding infrastructural and financial limitations in safely housing transgender candidates cannot be sustained or accepted as a valid legal defence for exclusion. A prominent public university cannot refuse to accommodate a vulnerable student from a marginalized minority by citing a lack of specialized separate wings, nor can it use structural constraints to strip a disabled applicant of their educational rights. Public institutions must expect the unexpected and remain proactively prepared to structurally modify and reasonably adapt their existing resources to support all intersectional identities. Financial or logistical hurdles cannot be weaponized to justify a total denial of basic campus facilities, as doing so defeats the spirit of

welfare legislation and results in an inhumane exclusion from the academic ecosystem.

2.4 While a delayed application submission past the official August 18 deadline constitutes a valid ground for non-consideration under standard administrative guidelines, the university should evaluate whether unallocated spaces can still be extended on humanitarian grounds to protect the student's access to lectures. Because the notice of hearing was delivered to the university at a late hour on December 11, the Respondent was granted an extension to file its comprehensive written response. The Respondent was recommended to submit its official written response and clear documentary evidence, explicitly proving the application generation date and verifying the total count of vacant or filled hostel slots, to this Court within seven (7) days.

2.5 The Respondent No. 2, Registrar of the University of Delhi, in its response filed through Dr. Vikas Gupta, submitted a reply vide letter dated 21.01.2026, that the university has neither committed any illegality nor discriminated against the Complainant on the ground of disability. The Respondent clarifies that the official deadline for submitting the relevant documents, including the CLAT Score Card, to the Undergraduate Hostel for Girls (UGHG) was 18.08.2025. The Respondent maintains that the Complainant uploaded her CLAT Score Card under the "CUET Score/Marksheet" section of the online form only on 20.08.2025, which is evidently beyond the prescribed timeline. Accordingly, the university asserts that any application submitted past the deadline is not valid in law and could not be considered for admission to the hostel.

2.6 The Respondent further submits that seat allocation for the B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) programme at UGHG is strictly limited to residuary seats that remain vacant after regular undergraduate admissions are completed. Therefore, no student pursuing the integrated law course can claim a hostel seat as a matter of right. The Respondent states that in accordance with the mandatory 5% reservation framework for PwBD students, 6 out of the total 120 available seats at UGHG were duly reserved and have already been entirely filled for the Academic Year 2025–26. The Respondent contends that since no reserved or residuary seats remain vacant, considering an application submitted after the deadline would be arbitrary and would violate the rights of other students under Article 14 of the Constitution. Consequently, the Respondent prays for the outright dismissal of the complaint.

3. Legal and Clinical Framework

3.1 After observing the submissions of both parties, the Court clarifies that

accessibility and reasonable accommodation are not matters of privilege or special consideration, but are fundamental statutory rights and essential mandates designed to ensure an equitable and convenient system for all citizens.

3.2 The Court observes that the Respondent's actions must be evaluated against the statutory framework of the RPwD Act, 2016, which mandates a transition from a welfare-based approach to a rights-based entitlement for applicants with disabilities. The actions of the college administration in leaving designated seats vacant while forcing a meritorious candidate out of regular education constitute a direct violation of the following provisions:

Section 2(y) – Reasonable Accommodation:

This provision mandates necessary and appropriate modifications and adjustments that do not impose a disproportionate burden, ensuring that persons with disabilities enjoy their rights on an equal basis with others. In the present case, this supports the Complainant's requirement for on-campus hostel housing, as private accommodations are financially out of reach and structurally discriminatory for an outstation student with a 48% intellectual disability.

Section 16 – Duty of Educational Institutions:

This section requires government-funded higher education institutions to provide inclusive and accessible environments, which includes the provision of essential residential and infrastructure support to maximize the academic and social development of students with disabilities.

Section 17 – Specific Measures:

This mandate requires structural modifications in the institutional framework to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities, specifically endorsing individualised support systems and priority campus allotments to prevent academic disruption and non-attendance.

Section 32 – Reservation in Higher Educational Institutions:

This provision mandates a minimum of 5% reservation for persons with benchmark disabilities. The Court notes that this protection is a non-discretionary baseline that extends holistically to the institutional infrastructure, including hostel accommodation, and cannot be restricted or denied based on arbitrary internal file policies or sub-categorizations of disabilities.

3.3 The regulatory framework governing accessibility and housing equity for students with disabilities in central universities is defined by several key directives from the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment and the University Grants Commission (UGC), which mandate inclusive facilities to ensure an equitable educational environment. The Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (DEPwD) Office Memorandum (OM) dated 29.08.2018, read alongside the UGC Guidelines for Access and Equity for PwDs in Higher Education, serves as a vital extension of these protections. These directives stipulate that central universities must maintain a fully operational Equal Opportunity Cell and ensure that physical and residential infrastructure is distributed transparently to prevent the systemic exclusion of benchmark disability candidates meeting the statutory threshold under Section 2(r) of the Act. The Court notes with serious concern that against these explicit statutory and regulatory mandates, the Respondent has failed to produce any verifiable evidentiary proof demonstrating active institutional compliance or transparent roster management.

3.4 In the present case, the Complainant has established such eligibility through the submission of a valid Unique Disability ID (UDID) certificate confirming a 48% intellectual disability, thereby surpassing the 40% statutory threshold required to claim non-discretionary reservation benefits. While the Respondent college relies on an uncodified internal prioritization policy to favour visual and locomotor impairments, the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs and Directorate of Estates Office Memorandum dated 22.05.2025 sets a definitive administrative precedent, establishing that a priority reservation framework across public residential and hostel spaces applies equally to all individuals holding a certified benchmark disability. Consequently, leaving two reserved PwBD seats and five discretionary hostel seats vacant while a qualified outstation applicant's written requests are ignored represents an impermissible administrative lapse that defies active government instructions and roster obligations.

3.5 The legal landscape regarding disability rights has undergone a transformative shift through a series of landmark Supreme Court judgments that redefine accessibility not as a charitable concession, but as a fundamental constitutional mandate under Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Indian Constitution. From the foundational ruling in *Jeeja Ghosh v. Union of India* (2016), which established that substantive equality requires providing necessary support to ensure human dignity and full social participation, to *Vikash Kumar v. Union Public Service Commission* (2021), which recognized that the right to reasonable accommodation is an autonomous component of equality, the judiciary has

consistently dismantled systemic barriers. This momentum continued with *Rajive Raturi v. Union of India*, which declared physical and institutional accessibility an enforceable legal right flowing directly from the Right to Life, and the Supreme Court's landmark jurisprudence of April 2025, which explicitly reaffirmed that turning a blind eye to procedural anomalies or denying enabling facilities constitutes actionable discrimination, shifting the burden of proof entirely to the institution. Finally, the Apex Court's consistent jurisprudence rejects "one-size-fits-all" administrative policies in favour of individualized structural protections, meaning that an institution cannot capitalize on a situation of non-attendance or forced migration to distance learning when its own failure to provide housing created those cascading barriers.

3.6 The Court emphasizes that the Complainant is an exceptionally meritorious candidate who secured an All India Rank 10 in the PwBD category and an overall rank of 2907 in CLAT 2025, which dynamically qualifies her for residential allotment on open merit, independent of restrictive category caps. The Court observes that an educational institution cannot force a high-merit candidate with disability into a narrow category container when her scoring qualifies her to compete against the general student body. In line with the landmark ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Saurav Yadav v. State of Uttar Pradesh*, it is a settled principle of law that reserved category candidates who are otherwise eligible for general category seats based on their independent merit must not be restricted or confined to their respective reserved categories. This foundational rule ensures that affirmative action policies serve to elevate those in need without undermining the meritocracy that underpins public educational selection processes.

3.7 Furthermore, the Court highlights that the high-merit standing of the Complainant entitles her to open category consideration under the enduring principles established by the Nine-Judge Bench of the Apex Court in *Indra Sawhney v. Union of India*. The legal framework mandates that candidates from reserved categories who qualify on open category merit must be counted against open category seats, thereby ensuring they do not exhaust the specific reserved category seats earmarked for other candidates who may lack the comparative advantage of a high rank. By failing to evaluate the Complainant's application against the overall institutional baseline and strictly using technicalities to reject her candidacy, the Respondent has ignorantly penalized exceptional merit. The purpose of statutory reservation is to dismantle historical and structural discrimination, and it can never be applied by an administrative body in a manner that converts a candidate's academic excellence into an absolute bar against their

institutional integration.

3.8 The Court notes that ground-level skepticism regarding the academic capabilities of individuals with intellectual disabilities stems from a fundamental misunderstanding of clinical and structural frameworks. Under the World Health Organization's International Classification of Diseases, 11th Revision (ICD-11), "Disorders of Intellectual Development" (6A00) are recognized as conditions characterized by significant limitations in intellectual functioning and adaptive behaviour. Crucially, a clinical assessment of a 48% moderate intellectual disability indicates that while an individual experiences distinct barriers in conceptual, social, and practical adaptive domains, their capacity for high-level academic achievement is fully preserved when supported by systemic reasonable accommodation.

3.9 The ICD-11 framework highlights that executive functioning barriers can be heavily mitigated by modifying the student's physical and administrative environment. For a regular law student, a 48% intellectual disability standardly requires accommodations that reduce daily cognitive overload and navigating anxiety. This includes the immediate allocation of campus housing to eliminate the disproportionate practical burden of navigating chaotic external transit systems and unstable private rentals, which directly trigger cognitive fatigue and sensory overload. Furthermore, it necessitates minimizing procedural complexity by recommending the university's Equal Opportunity Cell to act as an intermediary, thereby ensuring the student is not penalized for clerical errors or ambiguous digital portals. Finally, it demands providing structured, secure, and predictable living arrangements within the university perimeter to maximize independent daily functioning, which allows the candidate's verified logical and analytical capabilities to be fully actualized in her legal studies.

3.10 The Court highlights that the University of Delhi's official institutional framework explicitly secures residential access for gender-nonconforming individuals under the Policy for Transgender Students issued by its Transgender Resource Centre. This policy establishes a clear mandate to safeguard the rights, identity, and self-respect of transgender students by creating an educational atmosphere free from structural barriers, stigma, and violence. Crucially, the infrastructure guidelines within the policy expressly state that "hostel facility should also be provided to trans students," alongside the provision of healthcare facilities and gender-neutral restrooms to guarantee their safety and dignity on campus. Furthermore, the policy binds all affiliated university units to respect an applicant's choice of adopting binary identities, such as "male" or "female," and strictly demands that the administration manage their specific infrastructural needs rather than using their gender identity as an excuse for exclusion or secondary

displacement. Beyond infrastructure and residential mandates, the policy also contains explicit financial safeguards under its scholarship and welfare provisions, stipulating that higher authorities should consider providing entirely free admission to transgender students alongside granting concessions in college and hostel fees.

4. Observation and Recommendations

4.1 The Court observes that the response submitted by the Respondent is entirely futile and notes with displeasure the internal administrative delays, though a brief procedural lapse of two days is excusable and stands condoned under the present circumstances. The Court emphasizes that the principle of reasonable accommodation is a statutory, constitutional, and human rights obligation that should have been proactively extended to a meritorious person with a benchmark disability. A clear case of hostile discrimination is visible by the Respondent's failure to shortlist the Complainant's name for the initial hostel interview list despite her outstanding merit and high score.

4.2 Furthermore, the mandate of 5% reservation in higher education and institutional accommodation under Section 32 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, serves as a baseline to accommodate deserving candidates with minimal consideration, and it does not limit an institution from providing residential spaces beyond this minimum threshold. This statutory protection does not restrict eligibility exclusively to visual, hearing, or locomotor impairments, but explicitly extends to individuals with intellectual and psychological challenges who demonstrate high academic potential. Given that the Complainant is an outstation candidate with no residential alternative in Delhi, she represents a highly deserving category that legally merits campus accommodation on absolute priority.

4.3 The Court, following an exhaustive evaluation of the administrative gaps, systemic lapses, and the continuous structural exclusion suffered by the Complainant, issues the following explicit recommendations to the Respondents to ensure the absolute restoration of her statutory and constitutional entitlements:

- a. The Respondents shall immediately acknowledge that the Complainant is an exceptionally meritorious candidate who secured an All India Rank 10 in the PwBD category and an overall rank of 2907 in CLAT 2025; under established Supreme Court jurisprudence, a highly meritorious candidate cannot be forcefully confined to a restrictive reservation quota when her independent merit qualifies her to compete against the general student body, rendering the university's defence regarding filled quotas entirely inapplicable.
- b. The Respondent college shall cease relying on the justification that the 6

seats reserved for the PwBD category have already been filled to reject her residency; an institutional baseline of 5% serves as a mandatory minimum to accommodate deserving candidates and does not legally restrict or prohibit the administration from allocating spaces beyond that threshold to prevent the academic disruption of a benchmark disability student.

- c. The Respondents shall immediately abandon their inconsistent and shifting explanations regarding unattached or missing documents, noting that the Complainant's CLAT marksheet was readily available within the course application/public domain, and the university administration should have proactively incorporated it into the hostel allotment verification process through internal database mapping rather than penalizing the candidate on arbitrary procedural technicalities.
- d. The Respondents are strictly recommended to recognize that an educational institution has zero legal authority or discretionary power to doubt, cross-examine, or independently verify a person's self-perceived gender identity; if an applicant identifies as a female, that status cannot be used as an administrative ground for suspicion, profiling, or differential treatment. This is in absolute alignment with the University of Delhi's own Policy for Transgender Students, which mandates that institutions must respect a student's choice of adopting binary identities like "male" or "female" and creates a binding obligation to protect their identity, self-respect, and dignity from administrative hurdles and scrutiny.
- e. The Respondents are advised that if the university or college authorities harbour any genuine, non-arbitrary doubts regarding an applicant's credentials, the only legally permissible recourse is to formally request standard medical certificates or verified statutory documents through appropriate channels, rather than subjecting a vulnerable student to repetitive, humiliating identity verifications on campus. As per the University of Delhi's Policy for Transgender Students, such verifications must be coordinated through the university's specialized Equal Opportunity Cell, and brought forward via appropriate administrative or legal counsels rather than ground-level confrontation. The complete failure to utilize these established institutional mechanisms makes it painfully evident that the college administration was simply not prepared to accommodate individuals with these complex, intersectional needs, choosing instead to displace the candidate through systemic procedural friction.
- f. The Respondent 1 (University of Delhi) is called upon to clarify that if a female-identifying transgender student is excluded from a women's college, where exactly does the university administration intend to accommodate such

a candidate? The Court strongly observes that denying a campus space and an essential hostel allocation to such an exceptionally meritorious and highly deserving candidate, who holds an AIR 10 in the PwBD category, effectively forces her out of the mainstream educational ecosystem entirely.

- g. The Court strongly emphasizes that identifying, mitigating, and resolving logistical or infrastructural challenges in accommodating a female-identifying transgender student with an intellectual disability is the absolute statutory responsibility of the Respondent authorities, and under no circumstances can this administrative burden be shifted onto the Complainant.
- h. The Respondent 2, Miranda House, shall ensure that the Complainant is immediately re-admitted and restored to her regular B.A. L.L.B. Programme (Roll No. 2024/142) without being subjected to any legal, procedural, or structural inconveniences, credit penalties, or bureaucratic hurdles.
- i. The Court further recommends that the Respondents shall strictly implement the provisions regarding free education and reasonable fee concessions in hostel accommodation as enshrined in the University of Delhi's Policy for Transgender Students. The Court notes with deep regret that it is precisely due to these deep-seated attitudinal barriers, institutional stigma, and the active hostility harboured by the university staff that this exceptionally meritorious student was forced to sacrifice her regular education and seek refuge in distance learning. Therefore, if the college administration fails to execute this recommendation, it will be viewed as a continuation of that very prejudice, and the Complainant must be immediately provided housing under the non-negotiable mandate of special reasonable accommodation. Educational institutions cannot allow the personal biases of their administrative staff to result in the constructive expulsion of a vulnerable student, and the university must actively dismantle these barriers by enforcing her residential and academic rights on absolute priority.
- j. As a matter of substantive relief to mitigate the systemic harassment she faced, this candidate shall be provided her full course of study entirely free of cost alongside a reasonable concession in her hostel accommodation. In the event that the university asserts there is no existing internal financial provision to support this specific mechanism, it is the Respondent authorities themselves who will be legally bound to bear the entire cost of her education and residency to rectify her forced exclusion.
- k. The Respondents shall recognize that an applicant holding an intersectional identity as both a Person with Benchmark Disability (PwBD) and a transgender individual deserves the highest standard of institutional priority, affirmative intervention, and protective care from public authorities; the

complete failure to consider her unique functional barriers constitutes total irresponsibility on the part of the college and university administration.

- l. The Court notes with deep regret that it was precisely due to the deep-seated attitudinal barriers and institutional stigma displayed by the university staff that this exceptionally meritorious student was forced to sacrifice her regular education and take classes from IGNOU. The Respondents are strictly directed that this forced migration must not be treated as an administrative issue or used as a ground to deny her relief, as an institution cannot weaponize a situation of non-attendance that its own hostile environment created. Accordingly, her enrolment in distance learning shall not dilute her absolute entitlement to immediate regular re-admission and residential housing under the mandate of special reasonable accommodation.
 - m. The Respondents are hereby recommended to take immediate cognizance of the fact that entering the 2026–2027 academic session without a resolution represents an unconscionable further delay; having already violated foundational statutory laws, including the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act, 2016, and fundamental constitutional guarantees, the Respondents must strictly, unconditionally, and instantly comply with the operative mandates of this Court to facilitate the Complainant's formal re-admission for the academic year of 2026–2027 to prevent ongoing legal prejudice. The Respondents shall, while implementing this re-admission and housing allocation, take strict note of, adhere to, and incorporate all the specific statutory provisions, Office Memorandums, polices, landmark Supreme Court orders, and institutional circulars cited across the body of this order.
- 4.4 Accordingly, the Court advises the Respondent to comprehensively review its internal guidelines to ensure that outstation PwBD candidates are given structural preference in residential allotments, thereby preventing the constructive exclusion of vulnerable students from premier academic spaces. Given that the cumulative delays have pushed this matter into the 2026–2027 academic timeline, the requirement for an immediate, systemic remedy is absolute. Accordingly, an Action Taken Report (ATR) detailing the finalization of the technical arrangements, credit mappings, and the final confirmation of accessibility and housing protocols for the Complainant must be submitted to this Court within 30 days of the issuance of this order. Failure to comply with these recommendations within the stipulated timeline may compel this Court to initiate strict penal and coercive action as per Sections 89, and 93 of the Act.

5. Since the foundational issues concerning the denial of administrative

support, housing accessibility, and institutional exclusion are common to both filings, the Court, through this comprehensive order, is commonly disposing of both the cases.

6. Accordingly, the cases are disposed of.

S. Govindaraj

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities