

\$~11 & 12

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

(i) + **W.P.(C) 9467/2015 & CM APPLNs.22236-37/2015**

KAMAL JIT SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar Sehrawat,
Advocate

versus

GURU TEGH BAHADUR INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY &
ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Dr. Sarabjit Sharma, Advocate for
respondent No.1
Mr. Jasmeet Singh, Advocate for
respondent No.2

(ii) + **W.P.(C) 9482/2015 & CM APPLNs.22256-57/2015**

SURJEET SINGH SAINI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar Sehrawat,
Advocate

versus

GURU TEGH BAHDUR INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY &
ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Dr. Sarabjit Sharma, Advocate for
respondent No.1
Mr. Jasmeet Singh, Advocate for
respondent No.2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER

06.10.2015

%

In the above captioned first petition, petitioner-Kamaljit Singh is a
Teaching Assistant whereas in the second petition, petitioner-Surjeet

W.P.(C) 9467 & 9482 of 2015

Page 1

2

Singh Saini is Lab Assistant with first respondent. Memorandum of 9th September, 2015 (*Annexure P-1*) has been served upon petitioners while invoking the relevant regulations of respondent No.2-Committee.

Since the challenge to the impugned Memorandum is on identical grounds, therefore, with the consent of learned counsel for the parties both these petitions were heard together and by this common order, they are being disposed of.

Learned counsel for petitioners submits that petitioners had been exercising their rights for seeking redressal from various authorities and for this, petitioners cannot be subjected to disciplinary proceedings as doing so, would be totally unjustified.

Learned counsel for respondent No.1 submits that petitioners have not given response to the Memorandum (*Annexure P-1*).

In the facts and circumstances of this case, it is deemed appropriate to dispose of these petitions with directions to petitioner to file the response to the Memorandum (*Annexure P-1*) within a period of four weeks from today and first respondent shall take into consideration the response so filed by petitioners and thereafter, to decide as to whether disciplinary proceedings ought to be initiated against petitioners or not.

Let it be so done by passing a speaking order within a period of twelve weeks. In case first respondent chooses to initiate disciplinary proceedings against petitioners, then the said intention be made known to petitioners within a week after the decision is taken by first respondent. Needless to say, if first respondent chooses to initiate disciplinary proceedings against petitioners, then petitioners will have the remedies as available in law.

3

Let this order be complied with before initiation of any disciplinary proceedings against petitioners.

With aforesaid directions, the above captioned two petitions and the applications are disposed of.


(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

OCTOBER 06, 2015

S