

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.19663 of 2015  
Decided on : 11.12.2015**

Ambition Private ITI

... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India & another

... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA**

Present : Mr.Sandeep Khunger, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Rajiv Verma, Advocate, for respondent No.1.

Mr.Saurabh Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

**G.S. Sandhawalia , J. (Oral)**

Petitioner seeks a writ in the nature of mandamus to release the seats of 4 units for the session 2015-16, as has been approved by respondent No.1. Further prayer has been made to take a final decision on the representations dated 14.08.2015 (Annexure P8) and 08.09.2015 (Annexure P10).

It is the case of the petitioner-Institute that respondent No.1 had allocated seats to the extent of 4 (2+2) units, amounting to 64 seats on 30.07.2015 (Annexure P5). But there was a mistake in the said order whereby the total was wrongly mentioned as 6 (3+3). A clarification was also issued on 12.08.2015 (Annexure P6) whereby the total number of seats was shown as additional 4 (2+2) total 6(3+3).

It is the case of the petitioner-Institute that in view of the said permission and the assurance given by respondent No.2, admissions have been made against the additional 2 units.

In the written statement filed by respondent No.2, it is admitted that the letter dated 12.08.2015 was received on 26.08.2015 but the last date of admission was 31.08.2015. The same was under consideration but due to the paucity of time, no decision could be taken. It is also admitted that representation had been made but the admission process was already over and therefore, no decision could be taken. It is also admitted that the students have been admitted against the 2 additional units but the approval of the respondent-Department, it seems, has not been posted on the MIS system of the DGT and nor the admissions have been made on-line in the HKCL portal.

Thus, from the above facts, it would be clear that the petitioner-Institute had been granted the necessary approval for all 64 seats but on account of the procedural lapse on behalf of respondent No.2, necessary clarification could not be done. It is also admitted that the petitioner-Institute has taken a chance and admitted the students against the seats which had been granted by respondent No.1.

In such circumstances, the students should not suffer on account of technical lapse on the part of respondent No.2.

Accordingly, the present writ petition is allowed. The admission made, to the extent of 64 seats is, thus, regularized. Respondent No.2 shall take necessary steps to add the names in the portal and recognize the said admissions and pass necessary orders regarding their regularization.

With the abovesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

**DECEMBER 11, 2015**  
*sailesh*

**(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)**  
**JUDGE**