

\$~32

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 6589/2017 & C.M. No.27306/2017**
ADVANCE PRIVATE ITI

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Murari Tiwari, Adv.

versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TRAINING (DGT) & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Ms. Megha Rohatgi, Adv for R-1.
Mr. Sagar Shivam, Adv for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

% **01.08.2017**

The petitioner is aggrieved by an order dated 21.06.2017 vide which the application seeking accreditation of the petitioner institute stood rejected for the reason that although the petitioner institute had applied for two trades, one trade had been dropped on 04.08.2016 reducing the list of the applied trades to one trade alone.

The petitioner is aggrieved.

On advance notice, learned counsel for the respondents have put in appearance. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 points out that the petitioner was well aware of the circular of respondent No.1 dated 07.01.2016 which clearly provides that a new institute has to apply for a minimum of two trades. In this case although the petitioner had applied for two trades initially but in the course of the proceedings, he had dropped 1 trade; this fact being admitted, there is no fault in the order passed by respondent No.2 wherein his

application stands rejected.

In rejoinder, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he had successfully uploaded the submissions that he is applying only for 1 trade; inspection was conducted thereafter. On this score, learned counsel for respondent No.2 submits that these are auto-generated documents and the submission of the petitioner that he had successfully uploaded for 1 trade which was accepted by respondent No.2 is incorrect; this acceptance was only as per the software which has been fed into the computer of respondent No.2.

It has been put to the learned counsel for the petitioner that admittedly as per the aforementioned circular, he had applied for two trades. He admits this position. He also admits the fact that out of two trades, one trade has been dropped.

This being the position, the order dated 21.06.2017 rejecting the application of the petitioner suffers from no infirmity.

Petition is without merit; it is dismissed.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

AUGUST 01, 2017

A