

\$~50

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 7203/2017**
AHUJA PRIVATE ITI

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Murari Kumar, Advocate.

versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TRAINING (DGT) & ANR

..... Respondent

Through Mr.C.M.Goyal and Ms.Meghna
Rohatgi, Advocates for R-1.
Mr.Sagar Shivam for Mr. Vikas
Chopra, Advocate for QCI/R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

%

21.08.2017

Petitioner is aggrieved by the letter of rejection dated 18.7.2017 vide which his application seeking accreditation had been declined by respondent no.2.

Record shows that the institute of the petitioner had been inspected on 25.6.2017. 13 NCs were raised by respondent no.2 which had to be cured within a period of three days i.e. by 29.6.2017. Petitioner had uploaded all these NCs by 27.6.2017. His application was rejected on 18.7.2017. The reason for the rejection was that the experience certificates of two instructors namely Balvir Singh and Kanhiya Lal were not as per the norms of the DGT (page 55 of the paper book). Admittedly, the documents which had been uploaded were of Balvir Singh and Kaniya Lal. Contention of petitioner is that

he had replaced the aforementioned instructors namely Balvir Singh and Kanhiya Lal by appointing two other instructors namely Satyaveer Singh and Laxmi Narayan Sharma. This finds mention in para 19 of the petition. Para 19 further states that the relevant education and experience certificates have been uploaded with respondent no.2; petitioner had not furnished any fake documents; rejection on this technical ground is illegal; documents of Satyaveer Singh and Laxmi Narayan have been annexed along with the petition.

On advance notice, respondent has put in appearance. Contention is that admittedly the documents which had been uploaded by the petitioner were of the two instructors i.e. Balvir Singh and Kanhiya Lal, both of whom did not have the experience as instructor as per the norms of the DGT. This is an admitted position. Contention of the petitioner is that he had thereafter replaced Balveer Singh and Kanhiya Lal with Satyaveer Singh and Laxmi Narayan, however, the documents and experience certificates of Satyaveer Singh and Laxmi Narayan were not brought to the notice of respondent no.2; they were never uploaded.

The rejection order thus premised on the undisputed position that the experience certificates of Balveer Singh and Kanhiya Lal are not as per the requirement (being the only documents available with respondent no.2), suffers from no infirmity. Petition is without any merit. Dismissed.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

AUGUST 21, 2017/ndn