

\$~32

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **W.P.(C) 6868/2017**  
**SAHARANPUR PRIVATE ITI**

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Adv.

versus

**DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TRAINING & ANR.**

..... Respondents

Through Mr. C.M. Goyal and Ms. Meghna  
Rohatgi, Advs for R-1.  
Mr. Sagar Shivam for Mr. Vikas  
Chopra, Adv for R-2.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR**

**ORDER**

% **10.08.2017**

The petitioner is aggrieved by an order dated 27.07.2017 issued by respondent No.2 wherein the application of the petitioner seeking accreditation had been rejected.

Record shows that the Institute of the petitioner had been inspected on 28.06.2017. 24 Non-Conformities (NCs) were raised on 03.07.2017 which had to be completed within a period of three days. The petitioner had closed all NCs by uploading the response to each of them on 04.07.2017. On 27.07.2017, respondent No. 2 rejected the application of the petitioner on the following ground:-

*“The load of 5 KW has been increased to 15 KW by ITI and new meter has been installed few days after the assessment of ITI. Hence, this needs physical verification of new meter by revisit.”*

Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that this is an

illegal order; the load of 5 KVA which was the initially load had been increased to 15 KW and this is apparent from the documentary evidence which has been highlighted by the learned counsel for the petitioner. Attention has been drawn to a letter dated 20.06.2017 issued by the Executive Engineer (concerned Department) to the petitioner wherein the petitioner had been asked to deposit a sum of Rs.20,625/- as fee for the additional load of 10 KW to the existing 5 KW to make it 15 KW. This letter is an admitted document. Learned counsel for the petitioner has additionally drawn attention of this Court to the receipt dated 24.06.2017 vide which this sum of Rs.20,625/- was deposited by the petitioner with the Electricity Department. This document is also not in dispute. Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that on the deposit of the aforementioned sum of Rs.20,625/-, the additional 10 KW load had been granted to the petitioner enhancing the load of the petitioner Institute from 5 KW to 15 KW. Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that respondent No. 2 has rejected his application without application of mind. The objection taken by respondent No. 2 that a new meter has been installed after the assessment for which a physical verification is required is incorrect for the reason that the initial meter (No.30055246) has not been replaced; this meter continues to function at the site and this is clear from the bill dated 04.07.2017 raised upon the petitioner Institute which shows that the earlier meter No.30055246 is the main meter; since the load of 10 KW was enhanced, one more additional meter bearing new No. 15633390 has been added; this is not the case where one meter has been substituted

by another for which any revisit is required by respondent No. 2. Additionally attention has been drawn to a letter dated 29.07.2017 issued by the Executive Engineer, Saharanpur wherein it is certified that the electricity connection in the name of the petitioner Institute bears No. 30055246 and has a sanctioned load of 15 KW since 24.06.2017.

Record shows that all these documents were known to respondent No. 2; the documents dated 20.06.2017 & 24.06.2017 have certified that an additional payment of Rs.20,625/- had been paid by the petitioner Institute to enhance its load from 5 KW to 15 KW. The document dated 04.07.2017 showing the main meter still has the same number (30055246) to which an additional meter (No. 15633390) has been added was also a document uploaded on the portal of respondent No. 2. This thus made it clear that an additional meter had been added to increase the enhanced KW and no new meter had been substituted for the old. It is not as if one meter has been substituted by another for which a physical verification was required. This was just a procedural requirement which had to carry out by the Electricity Department in view of the enhanced load which had been granted to the petitioner Institute on 24.04.2017 which was admittedly before the date of inspection on 28.06.2017.

Another document (dated 29.06.2017) (not uploaded) also satisfies this Court that the electricity connection continued to be as per the old meter (No. 30055246). This objection of respondent No. 2 is thus without any merit.

Respondent No. 2 is accordingly directed to process the

application of the petitioner and forward the same to respondent No. 1 for necessary compliance. This be done within a period of 14 days from today.

Petition disposed of.

Order dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

**INDERMEET KAUR, J**

**AUGUST 10, 2017**

**A**