

\$~19

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

+ W.P.(C) 9156/2019 & CM APPL. 37823/2019

**BHASIN INFOTECH AND INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE
LIMITED**

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Abhimanyu Bhandari, Mr.
Aarush Bhatia and Mr. Sanchit
Gawri, Advs.

versus

PUNJAB AND SIND BANK AND ANR. Respondents

Through Mr. Rajinder Wali, Adv. for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

29.01.2020

1. On 17.10.2019, after hearing the parties, I had passed an order wherein the broad contours of the case and the grievance articulated by the petitioner was recorded.

2. However, before I proceed further, I must indicate that a typographical error has crept in the first line of paragraph 11 of the order dated 17.10.2019. Thus, instead of the word “therefore” appearing in the first line of paragraph 11 of order dated 17.10.2019, it should read as “however”.

2.1 Accordingly, the first line of paragraph 11 of the order shall stand corrected to that extent.

3. Moving on further, Mr. Wali, who appears for respondent No.1 bank was granted, on that date i.e. 17.10.2019, four (4) weeks to file a counter-affidavit. Concededly, no counter-affidavit has been filed to date on behalf of respondent no.1 bank.

4. Pertinently, since respondent no.1 bank has not filed a counter-affidavit, Mr. Wali is not in a position to demonstrate that the order declaring the petitioner company as a wilful defaulter was served on the petitioner.

5. According to the petitioner, the order dated 28.9.2016 was not furnished.

6. At this stage, Mr. Bhandari states that the petitioner company has also made a proposal to the respondent no.1 bank for One Time Settlement (OTS) of its outstanding dues.

7. Mr. Wali informs me that an OTS scheme is presently in vogue.

8. Mr. Wali says that if the OTS proposal submitted by the petitioner falls within the purview of the extant OTS Scheme, the same will be considered.

8.1 The statement of Mr. Wali is taken on record.

9. In these circumstances, the writ petitioner is disposed of with the following directions:

(i) Respondent No.1 bank will furnish a copy of the order dated 28.9.2016 whereby the petitioner was declared a wilful defaulter, within three weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

(ii) The petitioner, upon receipt of a copy of the order, will have liberty to make a representation to the Review Committee within 15 days thereof.

(iii) The Review Committee will, thereafter, convene and pass a speaking order on the representation made by the petitioner.

(iv) In case the Review Committee wishes to rely upon any document(s), it will furnish a copy of the same to the petitioner along with the copy of the order dated 28.9.2016.

(v) Pending consideration of the petitioner's representation, the order dated 28.9.2016 shall be kept in abeyance.

10. Resultantly, CM APPL. 37823/2019 shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

JANUARY 29, 2020

rb

\$~20

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9158/2019 & CM APPL. 37826/2019**

S. S BHASIN AND ANR. Petitioners

Through Mr. Abhimanyu Bhandari, Mr.
Aarush Bhatia and Mr. Sanchit
Gawri, Advs.

versus

PUNJAB AND SIND BANK AND ANR. Respondents

Through Mr. Rajinder Wali, Adv. for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

% **29.01.2020**

1. The substantive prayers made in the writ petition are as follows:

“a) quash the Impugned Publication issued by the Respondent No.1 declaring the Petitioners as Wilful Defaulters;

b) pass an Order thereby directing the Respondent No.1 to withdraw the name of the Petitioners as Wilful Defaulters on the List of Wilful

Defaulters published on the official website of the Respondent No. 1;

c) call for the records of the loan accounts maintained with the Respondent No.1 in the name of the Petitioners or Bhasin Infotech and Infrastructure Private Limited;

d) hold that in view of the Master Circular, dated 01.07.2013 & 01.07.2015, issued by the Respondent No.2 the Petitioners do not fall under the category of Wilful Defaulters;

2. Notice in this petition was issued on 17.10.2019.

3. Mr. Wali had accepted notice on behalf of respondent No.1 bank on that date.

4. Despite opportunity being given to file a counter-affidavit in

the matter, no counter-affidavit has been filed on behalf of respondent No.1 bank.

5. Mr. Wali draws my attention to the impugned public notice dated 30.5.2019.

6. Based on the public notice and the proceedings of the review committee of 28.9.2016, Mr. Wali says that only the company in which petitioners were directors was declared a wilful defaulter.

7. To be noted, the concerned company goes by the name Bhasin Infotech and Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.(BI IPL).

8. It is Mr. Wali's contention that the impugned publication was made as the petitioners managed the affairs of BI IPL in their capacity as its directors.

9. Furthermore, Mr. Wali says that the petitioners are also the guarantors of the debt owed by BI IPL to the respondent No.1 bank.

10. Today, on my board, the writ petition filed by BI IPL company is also listed as item no.19. This writ petition is numbered as W.P.(C) 9156/2019.

11. The said writ petition has been disposed of, *inter alia*, by giving liberty to BI IPL to file a representation with the Review Committee against the order dated 28.9.2016, passed by the Identification Committee whereby it has been declared a wilful defaulter.

12. I have also, as indicated in the very same order, that pending the consideration of BI IPL's representation the order dated 28.9.2016 will be kept in abeyance.

13. Given what has been articulated before me by Mr. Wali, it is quite clear that the impugned publication is a consequential step that respondent No.1 bank took after declaring BIPL a wilful defaulter.

14. Since BIPL has been given liberty to contest the order of the Identification Committee before the Review Committee and the order dated 28.9.2016 has been kept in abeyance till deliberations are completed by the Review Committee, respondent No.1 bank will indicate against the Impugned Public notice that the order dated 28.9.2016 has been kept in abeyance pending its consideration by the Review Committee.

15. Needless to add, if the Review Committee affirms the view taken by the Identification Committee, the respondent No.1 bank would be free to take consequential steps, *albeit*, in accordance with the law.

16. Resultantly, pending application shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

JANUARY 29, 2020

rb

\$~7

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10789/2017 & CM No.48018/2018**

SMT. MANJU SHARMA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dilip Singh, Adv.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY Respondent

Through: Mr. Vaibhav Agnihotri with Mr.
Sahithya Krishna, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

30.01.2020

%

1. The substantive prayers made in the writ petition are as under:

“I. To issue the writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ/ order/direction whereby directing the respondent to issue an Allotment cum Demand letter for the Plot No.137, Pkt-D-2, Sector-11, Rohini, Delhi as per the policy of DDA, in the interest of justice;

II. To issue appropriate writ/ order/ direction to the respondent to conclude the process of handing over the possession and executing the transfer document in a period of one month from date of deposit of lawful demand;...”

2. Pursuant to notice issued, the DDA has filed a counter affidavit in the matter. The DDA's counter affidavit sums up its defence and perhaps the case of the petitioner. For the sake of convenience, the relevant paragraphs of the counter affidavit of the DDA are extracted hereafter:

“...B. It is submitted that Smt. Manju Sharma W/o Sh. S.P.Sharma was registered for allotment of plot under the Rohini Scheme, 1981 vide Application No.181528. In a draw held on 21.02.1984 Plot No. 107, Pocket G-3 , Sector -16 measuring 25.9 sq. mtr. was allotted to her and demand-cum-allotment letter was issued to her on 02.07.1985.

C. It is further submitted that the Petitioner, vide letter dated 17.08.1988 was intimated that there is a requirement of submission of the requisite documents for issuance of possession of the plot. The petitioner was further reminded by the letters dated 04.10.1989, 20.09.1990, 13.01.1993, 12.03.1993 and 21.02.1994. She was also requested to attend the Lok Adalat organized on 19.06.1993 by way of press notification and the allottees were required to complete their documents. The petitioner failed to respond to that as well.”

D. It is respectfully submitted that the Petitioner was given final reminder to submit the requisite documents vide notice dated 12.03.1993. The petitioner failed to respond to that as well. In furtherance of Petitioner's inactions, the allotment of this plot was cancelled by the competent authorities on 15.03.1994 and conveyed to her vide letter dated 06.04.1994.

E. It is further submitted that the Petitioner represented to the Hon'ble' Lt. Governor, Delhi and the Vice Chairman DDA, for restoration and possession of the plot which was already allotted to her. The matter was re-examined and the allotment was restored by the Competent Authority and another area of land marked as Plot no. 137, Pocket D-2 Sector 11 measuring 26 sq. mtr. was allotted to her in a mini draw held on 28.10.2016...”

3. The sum and substance of the aforesaid extract culled out from the counter affidavit of the DDA is that though the petitioner's allotment was cancelled, upon a representation being made to the Lieutenant Governor and

Vice-Chairman of the DDA, her allotment was restored and she was allotted a plot described as Plot No.137, Pkt-D-2, Sector-11, Rohini, Delhi, admeasuring 26 sq.mtr. (hereafter referred to as the “subject plot”), in a mini draw held on 28.10.2016.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that the payments for allotment of the subject plot were made as far back as in 1985. This assertion has been made in paragraph 1 of the writ petition.

5. Once again, a perusal of the corresponding paragraph of the counter affidavit of the DDA would show that this aspect is not refuted by the DDA.

6. Mr. Dilip Singh, who appears for the petitioner, says that the only aspect which remains to be attended by the petitioner is to make payment towards restoration charges *qua* restoration of the subject plot. A further perusal of the counter affidavit would show that the reason the petitioner has not been given possession of the subject plot is that a complaint was, apparently, received by the DDA concerning alleged irregularities in the conduct of the draw by its System Department.

7. In this behalf, the DDA has averred in paragraphs ‘F’ and 10 of its counter affidavit that its Vigilance Wing on 12.06.2017 rendered preliminary finding report.

7.1 In this context, I had asked Mr. Agnihotri, who appears for the DDA, as to whether any irregularity had been noticed *qua* the petitioner. Mr. Agnihotri, on instructions of Ms. Sarita Bajaj, Assistant Director, DDA, informs me that no irregularity was found *qua* the petitioner.

7.2 Mr. Agnihotri, however, says that the final report of the Committee constituted for this purpose is yet to be rendered. Mr. Agnihotri says that

the final report of the Committee will be received in the next four weeks.

8. The record shows that the petitioner has been waiting for long years for being given possession of the subject plot, which was allotted to her in the first instance in 1988. The procrastination shown by the DDA has degraded the petitioner in all respects including financially.

9. Therefore, I am inclined to direct the DDA to hand over the subject plot to the petitioner within four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order, *albeit*, after deposit of requisite charges and fulfilment of formalities, subject to nothing irregular being found by the Committee constituted by the DDA *qua* the petitioner. In case an irregularity is found, the DDA will approach the Court for suitable directions and also apprise the petitioner concerning the irregularity found against her.

10. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 12.3.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

JANUARY 30, 2020/pmc

\$~164

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1193/2020 & CM Nos.3949-51/2020**

APPLE SPONGE & POWER LIMITED Petitioner

Through : Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Saurabh Kirpal, Mr. Manohar
Malik, Ms. Aakashi Lodha and Mr.
Sukrit Seth, Adv.

versus

**PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK THROUGH ITS
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER**

..... Respondent

Through : Mr. Suprabh Kumar Roshan, Adv. for
Mr. Abhinab S. Raghuvanshi, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

31.01.2020

CM No.3951/2020

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 1193/2020 & CM Nos.3949-50/2020

2. Issue notice to the respondent.

3. Mr. Suprabh Kumar Roshan accepts notice on behalf of the respondent bank.

4. The limited prayer articulated by the petitioner *via* Mr. Dayan Krishnan, learned senior counsel, is that it needs to have recourse to a policy, if any, framed by the respondent bank *qua* stressed assets under the Prudential Framework for Resolution of Stressed Assets of Reserve Bank of India (RBI) circular dated 07.06.2019.

5. Mr. Krishnan draws my attention to a communication dated 28.01.2020 sent in this behalf by the petitioner to the respondent bank.
6. Mr. Krishnan says that the petitioner has not received any response from the respondent bank *qua* the said communication.
7. Furthermore, it is also Mr. Krishnan's submission that an OTS proposal was submitted to the respondent bank on 19.11.2019, to which as well, no response has been received by the petitioner.
8. Mr. Krishnan further submits that the petitioner wishes to pay in one-shot Rs.28 crore as full and final settlement of all outstanding dues.
9. According to Mr. Krishnan, along with interest, the amount claimed by the respondent bank is, approximately, Rs.90 crore.
10. Given the fact that the petitioner's prayer is limited to aspect referred to above, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent bank to furnish a copy of the policy, if any, it has put in place pursuant to the RBI circular dated 07.06.2019.
11. The respondent bank will comply, as directed, within three days of receipt of a copy of the order.
12. Resultantly, the pending applications including the interlocutory application shall stand closed.

JANUARY 31, 2020

aj

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

\$~29

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1190/2020**

RELIGARE FINVEST LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Sanjeev Singh and Mr. Prashant
Tripathi, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Prasanta Varma, Sr. Central
Govt. Counsel with Ms. Hiteshi
Kakar and Mr. Amrit Singh Khalse,
Advs. for R-1.

Mr. Anil Soni, Standing Counsel with
Mr. Devesh Dubey, Adv. for R-2.

Mr. Apoorv Kurup and Ms. Nidhi
Mittal, Advs. for R-3

Mr. Zoheb Hossain and Mr. Piyush
Goyal, Advs. for R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

04.02.2020

CM APPL. 3938/2020

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 1190/2020

2. Issue notice. Ms. Kakar accepts notice on behalf of respondent
No.1/UOI, while Mr. Dubey accepts notice on behalf of respondent
No.2.

3. Likewise, qua respondent No.3, notice is accepted by Ms.
Mittal/UGC.

4. Insofar as respondent No.4 is concerned, notice is accepted by Mr. Hossain.

5. Respondent Nos.5, 6 & 7 are private respondents.

6. In view of the order that I propose to pass, for the moment, no notice needs to be issued to the private respondents i.e. respondent Nos.5 to 7.

7. The substantive prayers made in the writ petition are as follows:

“a. Issue a Writ/Command/Order in the nature of Mandamus or any other writ directing Respondent No. 3 i.e. UGC to revoke the affiliation of Respondent No. 5 for the next academic session 2020-2021 and direct Respondent No. 2 and No. 4 to withhold/discontinue the approval for the academic year 2020-2021 of concerned faculties in accordance with section 10 (q) of All India Council for Technical Education Act, 1987 and Pharmacy Act, 1948 respectively, since Respondent No. 6 & 7 had availed financial assistance from the Petitioner by creating Security Interest against PDM College of Engineering and Pharmacy (now merged as Constituent Faculties of Respondent No. 5), where to Petitioner has enforced its Security Interest to recover its total outstanding amount of Rs. 43,09,96,727.81/- (Rupees Forty Three Crore Nine Lakhs Ninety Six Thousand Seven Hundred Twenty Seven And Eighty One Paise Only), AND/OR;

b. Direct Respondent No. 2 to 4 to decide the Representation dated 19.12.2019 issued by the Petitioner and take actions in accordance with the relevant provisions, regulations and rules, AND/OR;

c. Direct Respondent No. 2 to 4 to safeguard the future of the current students of Respondent no. 5 by relocating the students to a similarly affiliated Colleges/ Institutions, AND/OR;

d. Direct Respondent No. 5 not to take further admissions for the next academic year 2020 -2021, AND/OR;”

8. As would be evident from the prayers made in the writ petition, which have been extracted hereinabove, the petitioner's grievance is principally against respondent Nos.6 & 7.

8.1 It is towards this end that directions have been sought against the official respondents i.e. respondent Nos. 1 to 4.

9. The petitioner claims that money is owed to it by respondent Nos.6 & 7 and that outstanding dues are secured via an immovable property which has been described in the writ petition as follows:

“i.e. entire building and land situated at and comprising Khasra No. 23, Killa Nos. 7/2/1, 12/2, 13/2, 6, 7/1, 14 Min, 17, 18/2/1, 16/1/1, 16/1/2, Khasra No. 22 Killa No. 9, 10/1, 10/2, 11/2, 12, 20, 19/1, 19/2, 22 admeasuring 41288.45 sq. mtrs. Sector-3A, Village Sarai Aurangabad, Bahadurgarh, District-Jhajjar, Haryana.”

10. The petitioner claims that a sum of Rs.43,09,96,727.81 is payable by respondent Nos.6 & 7. This sum is calculated as on 6.12.2019.

11. The petitioner also avers that in order to recover the said sum, steps under the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (SARFAESI Act, 2002) have been taken.

12. In this behalf, it is stated that an application under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 was filed with District Magistrate, Jhajjar, who, in turn, has appointed a receiver via an order dated 10.9.2019.

13. I am informed that the receiver is to take possession of the subject property on 12.2.2019.

14. Given the aforesaid circumstances, I am of the view that the writ petition can be disposed of with the direction to the official respondents i.e. respondent Nos.2 to 4 to hear the concerned parties and pass appropriate directions as per law.

15. The concerned parties in this case would be the authorised representatives of the petitioner and that of respondent Nos.5 to 7.

16. Therefore, respondent Nos.2 to 4 will issue notice to the petitioner and respondent Nos.5 to 7 for convening a hearing in the matter. The hearing will be, preferably, convened jointly. After hearing the concerned persons, respondent nos.2 to 4 will pass a speaking order.

17. In case this exercise is not completed before 6.12.2019, the petitioner will have the receiver stand over the date for taking possession.

18. Needless to add, the aforementioned exercise will be completed by respondent Nos.2 to 4 at the earliest. While doing so, respondent Nos.2 to 4 will also bear in mind the interest of the students.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 04, 2020
rb

\$~11, 12, 13, 34 & 35

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5726/2018 & CM APPL. 22233/2018**

CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF PRIVATE SECURITY INDUSTRY
THR SECRETARY GENERAL Petitioner

Through: Ms.Sumedha Dang, Advocate

versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents

Through: Ms. Vatsala Rai & Mr. Bharat

Makkar, Advocates for RBI

Mr. Sanjeev Sagar SC & Ms. Nazia

Parveen, Advocate for Union Bank of
India

Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC
for R-.2 & 3

Mr. Rajesh Gogna & Ms. Rahella

Khan, Advocates for R-3/UOI

+ **W.P.(C) 6118/2018 & CM APPLs.23745/2018 & 14572/2019**

PREMIER SHIELD PRIVATE LIMITED AND ANR..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Sonia Dube & Ms. Kanchan

Yadav, Advocates

versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents

Through: Ms. Vatsala Rai & Mr. Bharat

Makkar, Advocates for RBI

Mr. Sanjeev Sagar SC & Ms. Nazia

Parveen, Advocate for Union Bank of
India

Mr.Manish Mohan, CGSC with Ms.
Manisha, Advocates for R-3-4

+ **W.P.(C) 6655/2018 & CM APPL. 25361/2018**

SHIVA INDUSTRIAL SECURITY AGENCY GUJARAT LIMITED
& ANR. Petitioners

Through: Ms. Sonia Dube & Ms. Kanchan

Yadav, Advocates

versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
Through: Ms. Vatsala Rai & Mr. Bharat
Makkar, Advocates for RBI
Mr. Harshit Manaktala, Advocate for
R-2

+ **W.P.(C) 11301/2019 & CM APPLs.46732/2019 & 49277/2019**

PREMIER VIGILANCE AND SECURITY
PRIVATE LTD & ANR Petitioners
Through: Mr. Jayant Mehta, Ms. Sonia Dube,
Mr. Kaushik Chatterjee & Ms.
Kanchan Yadav, Advocates

versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA & ORS Respondents
Through: Ms. Vatsala Rai & Mr. Bharat
Makkar, Advocates for RBI
Mr. Sanjeev Sagar SC & Ms. Nazia
Parveen, Advocate for Union Bank of
India
Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocate for UCO
Bank
Mr. P.S.Sudheer & Ms Anne Mathew
Advocates for Axis Bank
Mr. S.K.Rout, Advocate for
Syndicate Bank
Mr. Rajiv Kapur, Mr. Akshit Kapur &
Ms. Tanya, Advocates for SBI
Mr. Syed Husain Adil & Ms. Nagma
Siddiqui, Advocates for R-3-4
Mr. Haider Ali, Mr. Krishan Kr. &
Mr. Mohit Gulati, Advocates for R-13
& 20
Mr. O.P.Gaggar & Mr. Sachindra,
Advocates for R-7

+ **W.P.(C) 12081/2019 & CM APPL. 49482/2019**

**PREMIER VIGILANCE AND SECURITY
PVT. LTD. AND ANR.**

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Jayant Mehta, Ms. Sonia Dube,
Mr. Kaushik Chatterjee & Ms.
Kanchan Yadav, Advocates

versus

AXIS BANK LIMITED AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. P.S.Sudheer & Ms. Anne
Mathew, Advocates for R-1
Mr. Harish V.Shankar, CGSC & Ms.
Gulabsa, Advocates for R-3-4
Ms. Vatsala Rai & Mr. Bharat
Makkar, Advocates for RBI

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

06.02.2020

1. A request for accommodation is made on behalf of the RBI on the ground that the senior counsel engaged in the matter is not available. The request is acceded to.
2. It is also noticed that some of the respondents have not filed their respective counter affidavits.
3. I am also informed by learned counsel for the parties that following matters i.e. W.P.(C)No.16864/2018, titled : *M/s. Albatross Securities & Allied Services v. Reserve Bank of India & Anr.* (Allahabad High Court, Lucknow Bench) and W.P.(C)No.19101/2018, titled : *M/s Ambey Enterprises Governor Reserve Bank of India & Anr.* (Allahabad High Court, Lucknow Bench) have not been listed before the court for the reason that relevant records have not been received by the Registry from the concerned High Court.

4. Given these circumstances, in line with the directions of the Supreme Court dated 23.09.2019 passed in Transfer Petition(s) Nos.1060-1062/2019, titled : ***Reserve Bank of India v. m/s Albatross Security & Allied Services & Anr.***, the Registry will accept the paper book from the concerned advocates in respect of the aforementioned matters supported by an undertaking that the paper book filed is no different from the one which was filed in the respective High Court in which the writ petition was instituted in the first instance.

4.1 These petitions will also be listed subject to completion of pleadings.

4.2 In case, fresh notice has to be issued, the Registry will take steps in that behalf according to the extant rules.

5. List the matter before the Joint Registrar (Judicial) for completion of pleadings on 17.02.2020.

6. List the matter in Court on 30.04.2020.

7. In the meanwhile, interim orders will continue to operate.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 06, 2020
Hk/VKR

\$~36

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

+ **W.P.(C) 12442/2019**

SHIV GOVIND MAHAVIDYALAYA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mayank Manish with Mr. Ravi
Kant, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER AND ANR..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Karan Sharma with Mr. Mohit
Siwach, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

06.02.2020

%

1. No time left. It is already 5.20 p.m.
2. Renotify the matter on 30.3.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 06, 2020/pmc

\$~43

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7931/2018 & CM No.30413, 38327/2018**

AARUSHI GARG

..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Seema Dolo, Adv. for Mr. Amit
Bansal, Adv. for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

06.02.2020

%

1. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.
2. The position was no different on the previous date.
3. List on 7.2.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 06, 2020/pmc

\$~44

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8913/2018 & CM No.34278/2018**

AMRENDRA KUMAR SINGH Petitioner
Through: **Ms. Gaurav Bhardwaj, Adv.**

versus

**ASSISTANT REGISTRAR EVALUATION
CENTRE JNU AND ANR.** Respondent
Through: **None.**

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER**

**ORDER
06.02.2020**

%

1. There is no representation on behalf of the respondents.
2. Ms. Ginny J. Rautray who otherwise appears for JNU is present in the Court. Ms. Rautray will inform Ms. Monika Arora, counsel for the respondents, about the next date of hearing.
3. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 12.5.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 06, 2020/pmc

\$~38 to 42

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

+ W.P.(C) 1766/2017

GULAB ANJANI CHOUDHARI INDUSTRIAL TRAINING
CENTRE Petitioner

Through Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Mr. Divyank
Rana, Mr. Abhishek Dhankar and Mr.
Ashok Kumar, Advs.

versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TRAINING & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ravi Prakash, CGSC with Mr.
Farman Ali, Adv.
Ms. Meera Bhatia, Adv.

+ W.P.(C) 1768/2017

GIRDHARI CHOUDHARI INDUSTRIAL TRAINING CENTRE

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Mr. Divyank
Rana, Mr. Abhishek Dhankar and Mr.
Ashok Kumar, Advs.

versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TRAINING & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ravi Prakash, CGSC with Mr.
Farman Ali, Adv.
Ms. Meera Bhatia, Adv.

+ W.P.(C) 1989/2017

VINDHAYANCHAL PRIVATE ITI Petitioner

Through Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Mr. Divyank
Rana, Mr. Abhishek Dhankar and Mr.
Ashok Kumar, Advs.

versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TRAINING & ANR.... Respondents
Through Mr. Ravi Prakash, CGSC with Mr.
Farman Ali, Adv.
Ms. Meera Bhatia, Adv.

+ W.P.(C) 2221/2017

JAGDAMBA PRIVATE ITI Petitioner
Through Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Mr. Divyank
Rana, Mr. Abhishek Dhankar and Mr.
Ashok Kumar, Advs.
versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TRAINING & ANR
..... Respondents
Through Mr. Ravi Prakash, CGSC with Mr.
Farman Ali, Adv.
Ms. Meera Bhatia, Adv.

+ W.P.(C) 2223/2017

NEW LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI PRIVATE ITI Petitioner
Through Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Mr. Divyank
Rana, Mr. Abhishek Dhankar and Mr.
Ashok Kumar, Advs.
versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TRAINING & ANR
..... Respondents
Through Mr. Ravi Prakash, CGSC with Mr.
Farman Ali, Adv.
Ms. Meera Bhatia, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

06.02.2020

CRL.M.A. 21412/2017 in W.P.(C) 1766/2017

CRL.M.A. 21476/2017 in W.P.(C) 1768/2017

CRL.M.A. 21475/2017 in W.P.(C) 1989/2017

W.P.(C) 1766/2017 & Conn.

2/3

CRL.M.A. 47204/2017 in W.P.(C) 2221/2017
CRL.M.A. 47275/2017 in W.P.(C) 2223/2017

1. Mr. Farman Ali, who appears for the applicants/original respondents says that the captioned applications are not pressed.
2. Mr. Farman Ali says that pursuant to an inspection carried out, affiliation has been granted to the petitioners in the accompanying writ petitions.
3. Accordingly, the captioned applications are dismissed as withdrawn.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 06, 2020
rb

\$~16

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **ITA 180/2014**
THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX-II Appellant
Through **Mr. Ruchir Bhatia and Mr. Shlok**
Chandra, Standing Counsel.

versus

MITUSUBISHI CORPORATION INDIA P. LTD. Respondent
Through **Mr. M.S. Syali, Sr. Adv. with Mr.**
Mayank Nagi and Mr. Pulkit Verma,
Advs.
Mr. Amit Shrivastava, Adv. for
Intervener.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER
% **07.02.2020**

CM APPL.7260/18

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

ITA 180/2014 & CM APPL.7259/18

2. It is 4:40 p.m. No time left.

3. Renotify the matter on 16.4.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020
rb

\$~2

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1657/2018**

HIMANI AGGARWAL

..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Athar Alam, Mr. Azhar Alam,
Ms. Bhavna Thareja, Mr. Shweta and
Mr. Umar Shaquib, Advs.

versus

**AMITY UNIVERSITY THROUGH
ITS REGISTRAR & ORS**

..... Respondents

Through : Ms.Binisa Mohanty, Adv. for R-1 & 2.
Mr. Apoorv Kurup and Ms. Nidhi
Mittal, Advs. for R-3/UGC.
Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC
with Mr. T.P. Singh, Adv. for R-
4/UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

% **07.02.2020**

1. An accommodation is sought on behalf of Mr. Amitesh Kumar, who appears on behalf of respondent nos.1 and 2, on the ground that he is on his legs in another court.

1.1 The request is not opposed by learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Accordingly, at request, renotify the matter on 21.07.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020

aj

\$~8

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10480/2019 & CM No.43337-38/2019**

SMT. MONIKA SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Meenal Duggal, Adv. for Mr.
Viraj R. Datar, Adv.

versus

**VICE CHAIRMAN, DELHI DEVELOPMENT
AUTHORITY AND ANR.**

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Arjun Pant, Adv. for R-1/DDA.
Mr. Gagan Gandhi with Mr.
Namandeep Singh and Mr. Mohit
Kaushik, Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

07.02.2020

%

1. Mr. Arjun Pant, who appears for respondent No.1/DDA, seeks and is granted two weeks to file a counter affidavit in the matter.
2. Likewise, Mr. Gagan Gandhi, who appears for private respondent i.e. respondent No.2 seeks and is granted two weeks to file a counter affidavit.
3. Rejoinder(s) thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.
4. Renotify the matter on 1.5.2020.
5. In the meanwhile, interim order will continue to operate.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020/pmc

\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 11756/2019 & CM APPL. 48302/2019**
SHRIISHWAR SINGH Petitioner
Through Mr. Susheel Sharma, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents
Through Mr. Mayank Sharma, proxy counsel
for Mr. G. Tushar Rao, Adv. for R-1
& 2.
Mr. B.L. Gupta and Ms. Akanksha
Malhotra, Advs. for R-3

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER
% **07.02.2020**

1. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2 as also respondent No.3 seeks and is granted three weeks to file a counter-affidavit.
2. Rejoinder(s) thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.
3. Renotify the matter on 14.7.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020
rb

\$~12

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

+ **W.P.(C) 3817/2019, CM Nos.17402/2019 & 26714/2019**

SELF-FINANCING EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS... Petitioner

**Through : Mr. Sameer Rohatgi, Mr. Namit Suri,
Ms. Soumya Sarin, Mr. Kunal Kumar
and Mr. Akshit Pradhan, Advs.**

versus

DIRECTORATE OF HIGHER EDUCATION Respondent

**Through : Mr. Ramesh Singh, Standing Counsel
and Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, ASC with
Mr. Anshuman Kumar, Adv. for
GNCTD.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

07.02.2020

At request of learned counsel for the parties, renotify the matter on
13.02.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020

aj

\$~13

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 921/2015, CM Nos.5483/2016 & 3518/2019**

SUMAN CHOUDHRY GAINDHAR

..... Petitioner

Through : Ms. Bhavana Jain and Ms. Tavishi
Vats, Advs. for Mr. R.K. Saini, Adv.

versus

ARUN GOEL & ORS

..... Respondents

Through : Ms. Gauri Chaturvedi, Mr. Paritosh
Dhawan and Ms. Shweta, Advs. for
Mr. Dhanesh Relan, Standing
Counsel for DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

% **07.02.2020**

1. Ms. Gauri Chaturvedi, who appears on behalf of the DDA, seeks and is granted further two weeks to file an affidavit in terms of the directions contained in the order dated 19.10.2019.
2. Accordingly, at request, renotify the matter on 05.05.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020

aj

\$~14

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5272/2016, CM Nos.21953/2016 & 3509/2019**

ANURAG SAHAI

..... Petitioner

Through : Ms. Bhavana Jain and Ms. Tavishi
Vats, Advs. for Mr. R.K. Saini, Adv.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

..... Respondent

Through : Ms. Shahana Farah and Md. Yunus,
Advs. for DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

07.02.2020

1. Learned counsel for the DDA says that he has filed a status report today i.e. 07.02.2020 vide Diary No.189495.
- 1.1 Learned counsel will take steps to have the status report on record.
2. I am informed that a copy of the status report has already been furnished to learned counsel for the petitioner.
3. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 05.05.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020

aj

\$~20

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1250/2020 & CM No.4320/2020**

CHANDRA PRIVATE ITI AND ORS.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat with Mr.
Divyank Rana, Mr. Abhishek
Dhankar and Mr. Ashok Kumar,
Advs.

versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TRAINING

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ajay Digpaul with Ms. Bakshi
Vinita, Advs. for R-1/DGT.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

07.02.2020

%

1. The grievance of the petitioners simply is that vide communication dated 09.01.2020, the practice of awarding grace marks in theory papers has been done away with.

2. Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, who appears on behalf of the petitioner No.2 to 25, says that although, the results were declared before the impugned decision, it has been applied to the concerned students who are before this court.

2.1 Mr. Sharawat says that the results were declared on 08.01.2020 and, therefore, the impugned decision squarely impacts the candidates in the captioned matters.

2.2 It is also Mr. Sharawat's contention that prior to the impugned decision, six (6) grace marks were awarded to the candidates.

2.3 Mr. Sharawat has placed reliance on a table which is marked as Annexure P-6 and appended on page 42 of the paper book to show that each one of the candidates require six (6) or less grace marks.

3. Accordingly, issue notice to the respondent/DGT.

3.1 Mr. Ajay Digpaul accepts notice on behalf of the respondent i.e. DTG. Learned counsel will revert with instructions.

4. In case instructions are received to resist the petition, a counter-affidavit will be filed before the next date of hearing.

5. Renotify the matter on 13.02.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020/pmc

\$~23

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1342/2020**

K R CHITRA & ANR

..... Petitioner

Through: **Ms. K.R. Chitra (in person).**

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondent

Through: **Mr. Sushil Kumar Pandey with Mr.
Raul Mourya, Advs. for R-1.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

07.02.2020

1. Issue notice. Mr. Sushil Kumar Pandey accepts notice for respondent No.1/UOI.
2. On steps being taken, notice shall issue to respondent No.2 and 3 as well. In addition, liberty is given to serve respondent No.2 via its standing counsel.
3. Counter affidavit(s) be filed within three weeks from today. Rejoinder(s) thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.
4. Renotify the matter on 31.3.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020/pmc

\$~26

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1394/2020**

MISS ANGELINA (MINOR) THROUGH:

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION & ORS

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Khagesh B. Jha, Adv.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi, Adv. for
R-1/DOE.

Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Adv. for
R-4/DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

07.02.2020

CM No.4860/2020

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 1394/2020 & CM No.4859/2020

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi accepts notice for respondent No.1/DOE,
while Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur accepts notice for respondent No.4/DDA.

4. On steps being taken, notice shall issue to respondent No.2 & 3.

5. Renotify the matter on 20.3.2020.

6. In the meanwhile, Mr. Tripathi will ascertain as to whether there is
any other school in the vicinity where the petitioner can be admitted.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020/pmc

\$~27, 28 & 55

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

+ W.P.(C) 1411/2020 & CM No.4913/2020

ARYA COLLEGE OF PHARMACY Petitioner

versus

PHARMACY COUNCIL OF INDIA AND ANR. Respondent

+ W.P.(C) 1413/2020 & CM No.4915/2020

RAMDAS NIKETAN COLLEGE OF PHARMACY..... Petitioner

versus

PHARMACY COUNCIL OF INDIA AND ANR. Respondent

+ W.P.(C) 1483/2020 & CM No.5144/2020

NOBLE COLLEGE Petitioner

versus

PHARMACY COUNCIL OF INDIA AND ANR. Respondent

Counsel for the petitioner: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat with Mr. Mr. Divyank Rana with Mr. Abhishek Dhankar and Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advs.

Counsel for the respondent: Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Adv. for R-1/PCI.
Mr. Devesh Dubey, Adv. for Mr. Anil Soni, Adv. for R-2/AICTE.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

07.02.2020

%

1. Issue notice. Mr. Hossain accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1/PCI, while Mr. Dubey accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2/AICTE.

2. Counter-affidavit be filed within four weeks from today.
3. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.
4. Renotify the matter on 16.4.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020/pmc

W.P.(C) 1411/2020 & Conn.

2/2

\$~29 & 30

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1421/2020**

ZYDUS HEALTHCARE LIMITED (THROUGH: ITS CONTITUTED
ATTORNEY MR. HIREN TRIVEDI)..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vivek Sarin with Mr. Satish C.
Kaushik, Mr. Dibya Prashant Singh and
Mr. Shauryaveer Saxena, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh with Mr. Rohan
Anand and Mr. Waize Ali Noor, Advs.
for UOI.

+ **W.P.(C) 1422/2020**

M/S LUPIN LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gopal Jain, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Vivek
Sarin with Mr. Satish C. Kaushik, Mr.
Dibya Prashant Singh and Mr.
Shauryaveer Saxena, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Vivek Sarin with Mr. Satish C.
Kaushik, Mr. Dibya Prashant Singh and
Mr. Shauryaveer Saxena, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

07.02.2020

CM No. 4950/2020 in W.P.(C) 1421/2020

CM No.4952/2020 in W.P.(C) 1422/2020

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 1421/2020 & CM No.4948/2020

W.P.(C) 1422/2020 & CM No.4951/2020

At request of the counsel for the parties, renotify the matters on 12.2.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020/pmc

\$~46

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 106/2020 & CM No.5030/2020**

SELF FINANCING EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS Petitioner

Through : Mr. Sameer Rohatgi, Mr. Namit Suri,
Ms. Soumya Sarin, Mr. Kunal Kumar
and Mr. Akshit Pradhan, Advs.

versus

**VIJAY KUMAR DEV (CHIEF SECRETARY),
GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI**

..... Respondent

Through : Mr. Ramesh Singh, Standing Counsel
and Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, ASC with
Mr. Anshuman Kumar, Adv. for
GNCTD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

07.02.2020

At request of Mr. Ramesh Singh, who appears on behalf of GNCTD,
renotify the matter on 13.02.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020

aj

\$~48

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1458/2020 & CM APPL. 5081/2020**

SH. BHARAT BHUSHAN

..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Amit Sharma and Mr. H.S. Rai,
Advs.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Rajesh Kumar and Ms. Saakshi
Agrawal, Advs. for R-2/CBI
Mr. Arjun Pant, Adv. for R-3/DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

% **07.02.2020**

CM No.5081/2020

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 1458/2020

2. Issue notice to the respondents.

3. Mr. Rajesh Kumar accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.2/CBI while Mr. Arjun Pant accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.3/DDA.

4. Learned counsel for respondent no.2/CBI will revert with instructions as to whether copies of the original record pertaining to allotment of the subject property can be handed over to the petitioner.

5. Renotify the matter on 14.02.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020/aj

\$~49

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1460/2020 & CM APPL. 5084/2020**

SHYAMANANDAN KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through : Ms. Tavishi Vats and Ms. Bhavana
Jain, Advs. for Mr. R.K. Saini, Adv.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Kousik Ghosh, Adv. for
Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Adv. for
University of Delhi.
Mr. T. Singhdev, Ms. Arunima Pal,
Ms. Manpreet Kaur Bhasin and Ms.
Sumangla, Advs. for R-2/MCI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

% **07.02.2020**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that she has instructions to withdraw the captioned petition.
2. Accordingly, as prayed, the captioned petition is dismissed as withdrawn. Consequently, the pending application shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020

aj

\$~51

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1475/2020 & CM Nos.5109-11/2020**

UMA SINGHAL & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through : **Mr. Sarbjit Sharma and Ms. Leeza
Taneja, Advs.**

versus

INDIABULLS HOUSING FINANCE LTD & ANR.... Respondents

Through : **Mr. Sunil Dalal and Ms. Kashish
Narang, Advs. for R-1.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

07.02.2020

CM No.5110/2020

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 1475/2020, CM Nos.5109/2020 & 5111/2020

2. Mr. Sarbjit Sharma, who appears on behalf of the petitioners, request for accommodation on the ground that he is bereaved.

3. Accordingly, at request, renotify the matter on 11.02.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020

aj

\$~53

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1481/2020**

CH. MEERUT INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION... Petitioner
Through : **Mr. Mayank Manish and Mr. Ravi Kant, Advs.**

versus

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER
EDUCATION AND ANR.** Respondents
Through : **Ms. Arunima Dwivedi, Standing
Counsel with Ms. Niharika Rai, Adv.
for NCTE.**

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER**

ORDER
07.02.2020

%

1. Issue notice to the respondents.
2. Ms. Arunima Dwivedi accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.
3. A counter affidavit will be filed within two weeks from today.
Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.
4. Renotify the matter on 24.03.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020

aj

\$~56

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

+ W.P.(C) 7931/2018, CM Nos.30413/2018 & 38327/2018

AARUSHI GARG

..... Petitioner

Through : None.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through : Ms. Seema Dolo, Adv. for Mr. Amit
Bansal, Adv. for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

% **07.02.2020**

1. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. The same position obtained yesterday i.e. 06.02.2020.
2. The record shows that even on 12.09.2019, the petitioner was not represented.
3. It appears that the petitioner is not interested in prosecuting the matter.
4. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution. Resultantly, all pending applications shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2020

aj