```
Karnataka High Court
Dr B Srinivasa vs Union Of India on 21 October, 2010
Author: H N Das
      IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT
      DATED THIS THE 21% DAY OF oCTOEER, -
      BEFORE
      THE HON'BLE MR. IUSTIC:E H.N. :iN.A:G~AMdH£iXN
      WP.No.16222~16227/EEEQEDNQRE§j'V':
      BEEWEIEN:
      1. I)R.E.sRINIvAsAV
      5/0 DBEERAPPA * '
      AGE:36YEARS V
      WORKING ASEENERAEDUTE__I\zI~EI3'I'CAL QFFICER
      PRIMARY I-IEAI.ITIIi 'c; »EIxITRIE. V I
      KANALLL.BEN.(}ALUR'E:E=NORTH TA-I;uI<"'
      BENGALURU LIR'I3A,.I\:1AI)IsTRIVC*-E,,_ -
      2. I)R.C.M.H'AFJLIMANT'IAIA»--RAIU
      S/O CHVIKKAMUANI'YF\.RAsF.FFA
      AGE: 37 YEA.RS '
      " 'wORI<IIxIC; --As GAENEl'{"A'f"D UTY MEDICAL OFFICER
       PRIMARY vHEA..L"I'{.-I CENTRE
      'NAMAGONDLUQ' {EOWRIBIDANUR TALUK
      CF}IKI?IA«BALIf;A_PUR'DIS"i'RICT.
       .3. DR';'3AN:rII0'sI«I BABU G.V.
      .. EIO H.G.VENAKATA REDDY
      f I' e "AG£:.37 YEARS
        wo.RI<I"I;~IG As GENERAL DUTY MEDICAL OFFICER
       ._ GENE'RA;L HOSPITAL, CHINTAMANI
        jCIIII<I<AEALLAF'IJR DISTRIC'1"»563 125
      " -, I4. DR. JAYANTHI RR.
      D/O P.RADHAE<RISHNAIAH SETTY
      9-...
      2'-._,,'
```

ΚI

```
ix.)
AGE: 42 YEARS
5. DR.SAV1THAM.S.
6. DR.SHOBHA.T.
AGE: 40 YEARS
```

rs.

```
='-J
J"
BENG£'ILURU--560» 94%.'
t(By.R.BASAvARA), ASG FOR R1 & 4
3. SECRETARY
HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE DEPARTMENT,
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA,
ViKAS SOUDHA,
DR.B.R.A§\/IBEDKAR ROAD
BENGALURU -- 560 001.
4. DIRECTOR
ESIS MEDICAL SERVIC ES
RAJAHNAGAR,
BENGALURU -- 560 010.
5. COMMISSIONER
BRUHAT BENGALURU MAIIAI~s Ac; ARA; PA L.I'I<1:§:AV.V '
CORPORATIONCIRCLE,
BENGALURU--560,00I . I
6. THE DIRE::TO R. OI~"?IyIfI:I1;CAI.EIIUCATION
ANAND RAO CVIRCL:E, ' M
BENGALURU
7. RIaGIS'I_RAR,' V".
RAJIV GANDHE .UNv.ERSIIy"O II'HEALTH SCIENCES,
4*" T BLOC K; }AYANA;QAR, ~~
```

;.Si'iv..I§H.,ETT"E5,ADV. FOR R2 1 . S131.«K;S[MAi.i;IVKAXRIUNAIAH, GP FOR R3 & R6 'SrA'e.NILOI;2FEiR AKBAR FOR R7 Sfi. I<.If~I.'I>U--\*I\*I'I:(;OwI)A, ADV. FOR R5) ...,\_TH}?.SE WRIT PETITIONS ARE FILED WA 225 3: 227 OF "CONSTI'II}'TIO1\3 OF INDIA WITH A PRAYER TO STRIKEWDOWN \_ -PRO'vISO TO REGULATION 9 OF MEDICAL COUNCIL OF INDIA VNRREGULATIONS AND DECLARE THE SAME AS UNSCIENTIFIC AND '«.I,"UNI~'I2;AsIBLE, IN SO FAR AS INWSERVICE CANDIDATES ARE j'CONCERNED AND ETC.

**RESPONDENTS** 

 $a_j\.$ 

These petitions coming on for orders this dayéthiei made the foilowing:

;

In these writ petitions the petitio7.ne1's have "prayedi" ~foir7.éi writ in the nature of certiorari to.\_4st~:ike down't.he"i□rs--t"f5roxriso to" Regulation 9 of I\□.edica}':'Cotincviiimofilririig.gegniatvionsij(for short 'Reguiations') and for ciirecting the respondents participate in PGET--2{)10 uncier in §serV:ice--t; 'L;; otai K \_ . -w'o; \*k.ing in the Department of Heaith and Farniieé2"We1f;irei,'i.:\_(}oirf:rnment of Karnataka. The second respondent'frarneti.r\_e\_gi.1latit)ns for the purpose of admission to PostiG'1'atiuate\_:in--.Medicine. The first proviso to Regulation 9 of the 44 Reg1: iati\_o11 is specify that a candidate shail secure a minimum of 50°/ogin the entrance test for admission to Post Graduation in . nied\*i'cal sciences. I3'etiiion.ers contend that for the academic year 'Q;\_;-.a~ 20102011, 118 medical seats were reserved for candidates. As against US seats only 86 candidates'"se\sured.\_x'. minimum of 50\% as speci Led in first \_prG'.!ISO ts) Regu--l§atie'11 of,' V the Regulations. Out 91' 86 Vsuccessf'u:l-\_:eandlda.tes. candidates opted for the seats and lgdtV:'admitlted.tlQ"PC The remaining 46 un\_tllleClJ':l'f€1fgattt'infseraleeulcandidate quota. In this 1'egard, Wlsgj-elation requested the Secretary, and Family WelfarevpvDepaltttrneftt:;tQ\_ proviso to Regulation 9, to alter \_fr<.)rn 50% to 45% in respect of General Merit VL\*at1;j§~.ida'rt\_es"and 35% in respect of reserved ll"candi<:lat3esA. RezaetingllItel the request of petitioners, the Secretary to Karnataka wrote to the Joint Secretary, l\/£in.i'stryv\*--.V(:).f Heal.t}'1 and Family Welfare, Government of India as lll.. □pe:'l\*Annexute--F dated 6.5.20lo. Further it is seen that the 'fiepartrnent of Meclic:s} Education as per coznmunication dated 22.3.2010 A.nm;'}:l.l..'(e'\*(l requested the Secretary to Medical f\...,r J"

(7 Council of India to alter the percentage from 50% to 45%. The Association of (i}<:>ver11tnem Doctors aiso requested th.e"se'cond respondent as per Annexure--H dated 26.4.2010 V' minimum percentage from 50% to:'i4i5°/6;'. p\_Sinc\_e Secend". respondent failed to consider the "..reicommendati'on fro"1n' Government of liarnataisia as periii"'A.nnexurevF 'hand and the representation at \_-i\11ne><u-r\_e}\*H, 'i\_the~pe'tit'ion'et\_s are before this court.

He;i.¢;--;t\_le;1rned"\*«.c\_o11n\_se1 for the respondents and perused the «entire papers. Petitioners remained unrepresented.

- 4. iiSi~ncc the second respondent failed to consider the iireqttest at.iPtnnef<t:"res~£i', G and H the petitioners are before this
- --V Cotitt'. regard to the practical difficulties expressed by the fpetiitiopners, the same requires consideration by the second i respondent. No p%.'e§L1CiiC€ wtii. be caused to the second respondent
- -\....r if they are directed to consider the request at AnneXures»F, G and H in accordance with law.

For the reasons stated above, the following order:

- i) VVri£ petitions are hereby disposed.
- ii) Second respondent is hereby' directed"to"cQnéidetc{he CG1E1{I1uJ'1§CaiiO1'} dated o6.G5.2U\_'\_1do'as com.1I1ur1iL'ati(',>n date'd...\_LuIZ"2.b3.20"10 as -pei $\Box$ x f5V{nv1déXu'fe~G 'V and the 26.4'Y.V201'{})v as per \_A"h?2';\_exot3e\$\psi1:c{--\_V\$4.1 accordance with law and as d expcd'itiokfs'1y booésibie. Ordered accordingky. I' ..... '' JUDGE