

\$~3

\*

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

+

W.P.(C) 5348/2017 & C.M. Nos.22636/2017 & 47270/2017.

ANUPAMA COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING ..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Aseem Mehrotra, Adv.

versus

ALL INDIA COUNCIL FOR TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND  
ORS ..... Respondent

Through Mr.Anil Soni, Adv.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI**

**ORDER**

%

**27.02.2018**

Vide the present petition, the petitioner has prayed for quashing of impugned order dated 30.04.2017 passed by respondent no.1, whereby its request for grant of extension of approval was rejected on various grounds including non-payment of salaries to its staff as per VIth Central Pay Commission's report.

Arguments in the matter were heard at length on various dates. Today learned counsel for the petitioner concedes that the petitioner/institute has not been implementing the Sixth Central Pay Commission in respect of its staff. He also concedes that as per the All India Council for Technical Education (Pay Scales, Service Conditions and Qualifications for the Teachers and Other Academic Staff in Technical Institutions (Degree)) Regulations 2010 it was mandatory for the petitioner/institute to comply with the recommendations of the Sixth Central Pay Commission while paying salary to its staff.

In view of the admitted position, that the petitioner does not

fulfil the requirements of the All India Council for Technical Education (Pay Scales, Service Conditions and Qualifications for the Teachers and Other Academic Staff in Technical Institutions (Degree) Regulation, 2010, I am not inclined to consider the other issues raised by learned counsel for the petitioner and the petition is liable to be dismissed.

At this stage, I may also notice that vide interim order dated 01.02.2018, the petitioner was allowed to submit its application for the academic year 2018-19 under the category of 'extension of approval' by paying the processing fee of only Rs.1 Lakh as against the categorical stand of the respondents that the petitioner's case had to be treated as case of 'Break in Extension of Approval' and the petitioner was therefore liable to pay a processing fee of Rs.3 lakhs.

In view of the decision taken by me that the present petition is liable to be rejected, the interim order stands vacated with a further clarification that the application filed by the petitioner will be treated on its own merits and in case the respondents require any additional documents or payment from the petitioner, the respondent would communicate the same to the petitioner and depending upon the response of the petitioner, the respondents would take further action as per law.

The writ petition, being meritless, is dismissed with no order as to costs.

**REKHA PALLI, J**

**FEBRUARY 27, 2018/sr**