

\$~77, 2, 4 to 56, 76, 78 to 230 & 246 to 248

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

+ W.P.(C) 9647/2020, CM No. 30902/2020
SANJEEV KUMAR VISHWAKARMA Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND

+ W.P.(C) 2093/2021&CM APPLs. 6128/2021, 6129/2021
DR. SAJAD AHMAD BHAT Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND

+ W.P.(C) 2126/2021&CM APPLs. 6216/2021, 6217/2021
PRETTY NEELAM TOPNO Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND

+ W.P.(C) 2139/2021&CM APPLs. 6231-6232/2021
NEERAJ GUPTA Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND

+ W.P.(C) 2141/2021&CM APPLs. 6247/2021, 6248/2021
NAJIM ALI Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND

+ W.P.(C) 2142/2021&CM APPLs. 6249/2021, 6250/2021
DR. SHEIKH MOHAMMED FAISAL Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND

+ W.P.(C) 2143/2021&CM APPLs. 6251/2021, 6252/2021
UMAR RASHID DASS Petitioner
versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2144/2021&CM APPLs. 6253/2021, 6254/2021
 SHAILENDRA KUMAR Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2145/2021&CM APPLs. 6255/2021, 6256/2021
 KAILASH CHANDRA DAS Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2149/2021&CM APPLs. 6263/2021, 6264/2021
 SHEMILAH FAYAZ Petitioner
 Through:
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 Through:
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2150/2021&CM APPLs. 6265-6266/2021
 KAMALJEET KAUR Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2151/2021&CM APPLs. 6267/2021, 6268/2021
 ALEX JOSEPH Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2153/2021&CM APPLs. 6271-6272/2021
 TAWSEEF RASHID Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2154/2021&CM APPLs. 6273/2021, 6274/2021
 DR. VINEETA GAUTAM Petitioner

versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2155/2021&CM APPLs. 6277/2021, 6278/2021
 ADNAN RASHID KHAN Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2156/2021&CM APPLs. 6275-6276/2021
 JAYAKRISHNA KHATEI Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2157/2021&CM APPLs. 6279/2021, 6280/2021
 SUHAIL AHMAD AHANGER Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2166/2021&CM APPLs. 6290/2021, 6291/2021
 FARAH NAQASH Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2167/2021&CM APPLs. 6292/2021, 6293/2021
 SHWETA KUMARI Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2168/2021&CM APPLs. 6294/2021, 6295/2021
 APRAJITA KUMARI Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2170/2021&CM APPLs. 6297/2021, 6298/2021
 RAMESH SAHA Petitioner

versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2172/2021&CM APPLs. 6301/2021, 6302/2021
 RAHIM UDDIN Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2173/2021&CM APPLs. 6303/2021, 6304/2021
 SREENU BANOTH Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2174/2021&CM APPLs. 6305/2021, 6306/2021
 YASIR REYAZ Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2185/2021&CM APPLs. 6364/2021, 6365/2021
 KAMINI KUMARI Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2199/2021&CM APPLs. 6390/2021, 6391/2021
 YOGESHWAR SINGH DADWHAL Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2200/2021&CM APPLs. 6394/2021, 6395/2021
 NIWEDITA Petitioner
 versus
 UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents
 AND
 + W.P.(C) 2220/2021&CM APPLs. 6455-6456/2021

PRIYANKA	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2221/2021&CM APPLs. 6457-6458/2021	
NEERAJ ARYA	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2222/2021&CM APPLs. 6459-6460/2021	
DR. RAM SINGAR YADAV	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2224/2021&CM APPLs. 6463-6464/2021	
VEERENDRA SHRIVASTAVA	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2225/2021&CM APPLs. 6465-6466/2021	
SAURABH CHANDRA MAURY	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2232/2021&CM APPLs. 6470-6471/2021	
KRISHNANAND MISHRA	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2235/2021, CM APPLs. 6477-6478/2021	
DR. BALMUKUND DHAKAR	
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2253/2021&CM APPLs. 6563-6564/2021	

RIJU DAS	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2254/2021&CM APPLs. 6566-6567/2021	
HARSH VARDHAN	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2265/2021&CM APPLs. 6587-6588/2021	
ANIL SHARMA	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2266/2021&CM APPLs. 6589-6590/2021	
KANHAIYA KUMAR YADAV	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2267/2021&CM APPLs. 6591-6592/2021	
ROHIT KUMAR TIWARI	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2308/2021, CM APPLs. 6708-09/2021	
YUSUF SULTAN	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 2312/2021, CM APPLs.6712-13/2021	
DR. ABHISHEKH	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2400/2021, CM APPLs. 6982-6983/2021
DINESH DE Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2401/2021, CM APPLs. 6987-6988/2021
AMARESH KUMAR SAHU Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2423/2021, CM APPL. 7060-7061/2021
KISHOR KUMAR Respondents
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2424/2021, CM APPL. 7062-7063/2021
MANOJ KUMAR Petitioners
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2464/2021, CM Nos. 7218-7219/2021
RAJDEEP GHOSH Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2645/2021, CM Nos. 7847/2021 & 7848/2021
ANKUR TIWARI Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2655/2021, CM Nos. 7860/2021 & 7861/2021
VAIBHAV KOUTU Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2658/2021, CM Nos. 7866/2021 & 7867/2021
SWARNIM SONI Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2659/2021, CM APPL. 7868/2021 & 7869/2021
YOGESH KUMAR SARIYA Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2660/2021, CM Nos. 7870/2021 & 7871/2021
DR. PURUSHOTTAM GANGSAR Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2661/2021, CM APPL. 7872/2021 & 7873/2021
PERLA HARISH Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2662/2021, CM APPL. 7874/2021 & 7875/2021
NILESH SARKAR Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2738/2021, CM APPL. 8157/2021&8158/2021
VAIBHAV KUMAR Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2765/2021, CM APPL. 8317/2021&8318/2021
ANISH KUMAR SHUKLA Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND

+	W.P.(C) 9646/2020, CM No. 30900/2020 PRINCE KUMAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9648/2020, CM No. 30905/2020 SHIB SANKAR NATH	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9649/2020, CM No. 30907/2020 TAMAR DAS	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9650/2020, CM No. 30910/2020 SUSOBHAN DAS	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9651/2020, CM No. 30911/2020 JOYDEB SARKAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9662/2020, CM No. 30937/2020 GOLAM IMRAN HUSSAIN	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9664/2020, CM No. 30941/2020 DR. SUPANTHA PAUL	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9665/2020, CM No. 30945/2020 PRASENJIT SARKHEL	 Petitioner
	versus	

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 9668/2020, CM No. 30949/2020	
DR. ABHISHEK BHATTACHERJEE	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 9675/2020, CM No. 30962/2020	
DR. DWIPJOY SARKAR	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 9677/2020, CM No. 30968/2020	
ABHISHEK KUMAR	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 9678/2020, CM No. 30970/2020	
DR. SUMAN SUTRADHAR	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 9699/2020, CM No. 31015/2020	
MADHVI SAXENA	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 9700/2020, CM No. 31020/2020	
KOUSHIK KALITA	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 9701/2020, CM No. 31023/2020	
PRANJAL KUMAR SHARMA	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	

+	W.P.(C) 9702/2020, CM No. 31027/2020 PARAG KAMAL TALUKDAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9703/2020, CM No. 31030/2020 NABASMITA PHUKAN	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9717/2020, CM No. 31052/2020 RABEL GUHARROY	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9871/2020, CM No. 31498/2020 DR. PEEYUSH KALA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9872/2020, CM No. 31500/2020 DR. ASHISH KUMAR GULERIA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9873/2020, CM No. 31502/2020 ATMA PRASAD RAI	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9937/2020, CM No. 31630/2020 MOHIT JAIN	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 9938/2020, CM No. 31632/2020 LAV UPADHYAY	 Petitioner
	versus	

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 9945/2020, CM No. 31642/2020	
SNEHA GARG	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 10037/2020, CM No. 31959/2020	
ASHOK MANORI	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 10038/2020, CM No. 31961/2020	
DEEPAK JANGID	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 10039/2020, CM No. 31963/2020	
ASHUTOSH BHATT	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 10042/2020, CM No. 31974/2020	
SHIVAM GUPTA	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 10043/2020, CM No. 31976/2020	
UTKARSH SRIVASTAVA	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	
+ W.P.(C) 10044/2020, CM No. 31978/2020	
DR. RIAZ ALI KHAN	 Petitioner
versus	
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND	

+	W.P.(C) 10045/2020, CM No. 31980/2020 DR. NEETA BACHHETI THAPLIYAL	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10047/2020, CM No. 31984/2020 DR. NAVEEN CHANDRA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10049/2020, CM No. 31988/2020 AMIT KUMAR GORIYAN	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10050/2020, CM No. 31990/2020 LOHIT JAIN	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10051/2020, CM No. 31992/2020 DR. NAV RATTAN	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10095/2020, CM No. 32137/2020 POOJA AGRAWAL	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10096/2020, CM No. 32139/2020 SHEO KUMAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10097/2020, CM No. 32141/2020 DR. GARIMA SINGH BAGHEL	 Petitioner
	versus	

	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10098/2020, CM No. 32143/2020 DHRUV MAGGU	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10099/2020, CM No. 32145/2020 NAMRATA AGRAWAL	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10100/2020, CM No. 32147/2020 JASHEER SHIHAB TV	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10101/2020, CM No.32149/2020 DR. RANJAN KISHORE MALLICK	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10102/2020, CM No. 32151/2020 DR. JAFAR SADIQ E	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10119/2020, CM No. 32186/2020 PRAVEEN KUMAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10171/2020, CM No. 32370/2020 KANDIBOINA RAGHUPATHI	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		

+	W.P.(C) 10206/2020, CM No. 32395/2020 NIPUN GUPTA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10219/2020, CM No. 32424/2020 DR. GAURAV UPADHYAY	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10221/2020, CM No. 32429/2020 SHASHANK SHARMA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10272/2020, CM No. 32521/2020 AISHWARYA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10378/2020, CM No. 32835/2020 MOHIT AGGARWAL	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10379/2020, CM No. 32843/2020 RAHUL SAGWAL	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10380/2020, CM No. 32845/2020 SHAIENDRA PRATAP SINGH	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10392/2020, CM No. 32898/2020 IDRIS AFZAL SHAH	 Petitioner
	versus	

	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10393/2020, CM No. 32900/2020 AJAY SINGH RAJPUT	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10435/2020, CM No. 33029/2020 SUPRATIM DAS	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10436/2020, CM No. 33031/2020 SUNDARAM	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10437/2020, CM No. 33033/2020 SUBHRANSHU SEKHAR MALLICK	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10440/2020, CM No. 33038/2020 DR. SANDEEP THAKUR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10441/2020, CM No. 33040/2020 BIBHUTI BHUSHAN BHARDWAJ	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10482/2020, CM Nos. 33169/2020&33170/2020 JYOTHIS A	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		

+ W.P.(C) 10493/2020, CM No. 33196/2020 ANURAG SHARMA versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 10495/2020, CM No. 33199/2020 KUMARI NUTAN SINGH versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 10497/2020, CM No.33203/2020 DR. RAVI KUMAR versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 10499/2020, CM No. 33205/2020 DHARMENDRA KUMAR SINGH versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 10501/2020, CM No. 33209/2020 MANOJIT SEAL versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 10612/2020, CM No. 33440/2020 SIRAJUDHEEN CH versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 10693/2020, CM No. 33570/2020 FAISAL RASHEED LONE versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 10695/2020, CM No. 33582/2020 ADITYA GUPTA	 Petitioner Respondents Petitioner Respondents Petitioner Respondents Petitioner Respondents Petitioner Respondents Petitioner Respondents Petitioner
--	---

	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10697/2020, CM No. 33586/2020	
	ASUTYA KUMAR BISWAL	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10699/2020, CM No. 33593/2020	
	LAL SINGH KALUNDIA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10701/2020, CM No. 33600/2020	
	BADRI NARAYAN PANIGRAHI	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10703/2020, CM No. 33602/2020	
	DURIYA MURALI	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10707/2020, CM No. 33607/2020	
	SUBRAT KUMAR BISWAL	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10715/2020, CM No. 33621/2020	
	DR. DEBAKANTA TRIPATHY	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10718/2020, CM No. 33625/2020	
	SASWAT BISWAPRIYA DASH	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents

AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10719/2020 SUCHIT KUMAR GUPTA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10720/2020, CM No. 33627/2020 HEMANT MODI	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10721/2020, CM No. 33629/2020 NILADRI MAITY	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10722/2020, CM No. 33631/2020 PUNEET KUMAR NEMA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10726/2020, CM No. 33637/2020 JAGABANDHU MAJHI	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10728/2020, CM No. 33641/2020 PARTHA SARATHI MISHRA	 Petitioner
	Versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10730/2020, CM No. 33646/2020 MANI THAKUR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10731/2020, CM No. 33648/2020 SWAGAT DWIBEDI	 Petitioner

	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10732/2020, CM No. 33650/2020 HAMID RAZA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10733/2020, CM No. 33652/2020 ASIM KUMAR MISRA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10734/2020, CM No. 33654/2020 IMTIYAZ KHAN	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10745/2020, CM No. 33671/2020 DR. ABHILASH PUROHIT	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10746/2020, CM No. 33673/2020 ABHIJEET SWAIN	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10781/2020, CM No. 33826/2020 ANUKUL PRASAD PARHI	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10788/2020, CM No. 33835/2020 KRISHAN KUMAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents

AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10789/2020, CM No. 33837/2020 SANTOSH SAHU	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10801/2020, CM No.33861/2020 DR. DEEPTI GUPTA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10804/2020, CM No. 33893/2020 DR. SUHAIB AHMED BATT	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10933/2020, CM No. 34256/2020 DR. SPARSH SHARMA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10940/2020, CM No. 34277/2020 SURAJ SINGH CHAND	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10941/2020, CM No. 34279/2020 POTHURAJU PRABHU KUMAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10947/2020, CM No. 34290/2020 SUMIT KUMAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10948/2020, CM No. 34292/2020 JOBIN MATHEW	 Petitioner

	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10951/2020, CM No. 34297/2020	
	ASHUTOSH PIPRAIYA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10952/2020, CM No. 34299/2020	
	RAHUL KUMAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10978/2020, CM No. 34341/2020	
	BAHARUL HUSSAIN	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10980/2020, CM No. 34346/2020	
	MUKESH KUMAR SINGH	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 10981/2020, CM No. 34348/2020	
	RHITTIKRAJ MOUDGOLLYA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 11005/2020, CM No. 34387/2020	
	RATNAM DODDA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 11006/2020, CM No. 34391/2020	
	NILABH KUMAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		

+ W.P.(C) 11031/2020, CM No. 34466/2020 HIMADRI VAIDYA versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 11036/2020, CM No. 34476/2020 TAWSEEF AYOUB SHAIKH versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 11046/2020, CM No. 34501/2020 ASHUTOSH BISWAL versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 11070/2020, CM No. 34569/2020 CHANDAN KUMAR versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 11075/2020, CM No. 34579/2020 DR. RAMANDEEP KAUR versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 11076/2020, CM No. 34581/2020 GAURAV MAITHANI versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 11115/2020, CM No. 34707/2020 ARINDAM SARKAR versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS. AND + W.P.(C) 11121/2020, CM No. 34719/2020 BHAVNA RATHORE	 Petitioner Respondents Petitioner Respondents Petitioner Respondents Petitioner Respondents Petitioner Respondents Petitioner Respondents Petitioner
--	---

	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 11126/2020, CM No. 34732/2020 AMIT KUMAR SRIVASTAVA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 11129/2020, CM No. 34742/2020 VIJAY KUMAR TIWARI	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 11130/2020, CM No. 34744/2020 DR. ADITI CHATTERJEE	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 11196/2020, CM No. 34911/2020 MONIA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 11202/2020, CM No. 34931/2020 SUBHASH CHAND PAL	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 112/2021, CM No. 334/2021 BILAL AHMAD CHAT	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 117/2021, CM Nos. 366/2021 & 367/2021 GOURAV KUMAR SHARMA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 127/2021, CM Nos. 393/2021 & 394/2021
DR. TANMOY MAJUMDER Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 136/2021, CM Nos. 412/2021 & 413/2021
VINAY SINGH Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 137/2021, CM Nos. 414/2021 & 415/2021
KHEMRAJ SAHU Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 143/2021, CM Nos. 429/2021 & 430/2021
SNOWBER MUSHTAQ Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 150/2021, CM Nos. 445/2021 & 446/2021
SATYA PRAKASH Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 227/2021, CM No. 593/2021 & 594/2021
SHAFAT AHMAD KHAN Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 228/2021, CM No. 597/2021
PANKAJ SINGH Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 243/2021, CM No. 633/2021
LALIT MOHAN GOSWAMI Petitioner

	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 246/2021, CM No. 635/2021	
	SAYED SADULLA AHMED	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 247/2021, CM No. 637/2021	
	MANOJ KUMAR TRIVENI	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 687/2021, CM Nos. 1683/2021&1684/2021	
	ARABINDA PANDA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 688/2021, CM Nos. 1685/2021&1686/2021	
	BISWAJIT SAHOO	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 689/2021, CM Nos. 1687/2021&1688/2021	
	LALIT KUMAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 693/2021, CM Nos. 1700/2021&1701/2021	
	PRATEEK MISHRA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 694/2021, CM Nos. 1702/2021&1703/2021	
	MOHIT KUMAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 695/2021, CM Nos. 1704/2021&1705/2021
RAMESH CHOTIYA Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 696/2021, CM Nos. 1706/2021&1707/2021
AMIT PANWAR Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 699/2021, CM Nos. 1719/2021&1720/2021
ASHOK VERMA Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 700/2021, CM Nos. 1736/2021&1737/2021
KAPIL MOHAN Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 701/2021, CM Nos. 1738/2021&1739/2021
CHANDNI BANSAL Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 702/2021, CM Nos. 1740/2021&1741/2021
PRANKIT GUPTA Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 703/2021, CM Nos. 1742/2021&1743/2021
SAUMY AGARWAL Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 704/2021, CM Nos. 1744/2021&1745/2021
KUNDAN KUMAR Petitioner

	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 705/2021, CM Nos. 1746/2021&1747/2021	
	DEV PRAKASH SATSANGI	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 706/2021, CM Nos. 1748/2021&1749/2021	
	VAIBHAV GUPTA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 707/2021, CM Nos. 1750/2021&1751/2021	
	VIVEK RASTOGI	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 708/2021, CM Nos. 1752/2021&1753/2021	
	SIDHARTH KUMAR	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 709/2021, CM Nos. 1754/2021&1755/2021	
	ALTAF AHMAD BHAT	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 745/2021, CM Nos. 1862/2021&1863/2021	
	DR. TANMOY RATH	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents
AND		
+	W.P.(C) 746/2021, CM Nos. 1864/2021&1865/2021	
	RAM BABU NIMMA	 Petitioner
	versus	
	UNION OF INDIA & ORS.	 Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2010/2021, CM Nos. 5882/2021 & 5883/2021
MOHD RAFI LONE Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2011/2021, CM Nos. 5884/2021 & 5885/2021
VAQAS HUSSIAN SHEIKH Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2015/2021, CM Nos. 5892/2021 & 5893/2021
MAHENDRA KUMAR SONI Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 2039/2021, CM Nos. 5983/2021 & 5984/2021
SAJJAD AHMED Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 3300/2021, CM Nos. 10080/2021&10081/2021
MOHAMMAD KHALID PANDIT Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 3302/2021, CM Nos. 10084/2021&10085/2021
DR. ASHISH KUMAR ROY Petitioner
Versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

AND
+ W.P.(C) 3314/2021, CM Nos. 10105/2021&10106/2021
DR. GAGAN BIHARI PRADHAN Petitioner
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

Through:

Mr.Jayant Mehta, Mr. Abhijit Sengupta,

Mr. Dibadyuti Banerjee and Mr. Srideep Chatterjee, Advs. for petitioners in item nos. 2, 4 to 56, 76 to 230 and 246-248.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Raj Kumar Yadav, Sr. Panel Counsel with Mr. Amit Acharya, Adv. for respondent UOI in item nos. 107 & 125.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Ms. Arti Bansal, Adv. for respondent UOI in item no. 130.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Harish Kumar Agrawal, Sr. Panel Counsel with Mr. Mudit Grover, Adv. for UOI in item no. 93.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Gigi C. George, Sr. Panel Counsel for respondent UOI in item no. 122.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Niharika Jauhari, Advs. for UOI in item no. 116.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Dev. P. Bhardwaj, CGSC for UOI in item nos. 79 and 103.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel Mr. Sushil Kumar Pandey, Sr. Panel Counsel with Mr. Rahul Mourya and Ms. Dakshita, Advs. and Ms. Dacchita Shani, Govt.

Pleader for UOI in item no. 96.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. D.S. Mahendru, Sr. Panel Counsel for UOI in item nos. 81 and 211.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Rahul Sharma, Adv. for UOI in item no. 111.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Vijay Joshi, Adv. and Mr. Akshat, Govt. Pleader for UOI in item no. 97.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Anil Dabas and Mr. Satender Mann, Adv. for UOI in item no. 95.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Ajay Dipaul CGSC with Mr. Kamal R. Digpaul, Adv. for UOI in item no. 121.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC for UOI in item no. 90.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Jaswinder Singh, Adv. for UOI in item no. 92.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Tanveer Ahmed Ansari, Sr. Panel Counsel for respondent UOI in item no. 84.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Nirvikar Verma, Adv. for UOI in item no. 78 and 124.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Rajesh Kumar Gogna, CGSC with Mr. K.L. Acharya, Adv. for UOI in item no. 77.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Jivesh Tiwari, Sr. Panel Counsel for UOI in item nos. 127 and 119.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, CGSC for UOI item no. 85.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Ms. Aakanksha Kaul and Mr. Manek Singh, Adv. for UOI in item no. 173.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with Mr. Waize Ali Noor and Ms. Taha Yasin, Adv. for UOI in item no. 111.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Vikrant N. Goyal, Adv. for UOI in item nos. 91.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Jaswant Rai Aggarwal and Mr. Suraj Kumar, Advs. for UOI in item no. 114.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Ms. Saroj Bidawat, Adv. for UOI in item no. 99.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Ms. Prema Priyadarshini, Adv. for UOI in item no. 104.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, Sr. Panel Counsel for UOI in item no. 128.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Naginder Benipal, Sr. Panel Counsel with Ms. Harithi Kambiri and Mr. Sonu Chaudhary, Advs. for UOI in item no. 112.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. R.V. Sinha, Mr. Amit Sinha and Mr. A.S.Singh, Advs. for UOI in item no. 182.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Ruchir Mishra, Sr. Panel Counsel with Mr. Ramneek Mishra, Adv. for UOI in item no. 108.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Jayant Bhatt, Sr. Panel Counsel with Ms. Nayantara Sharma and Ms. Deepali Suri, Advs. for R3 in item no. 106.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Anil Kaushik, CGSC for UOI in item no. 109.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mrs. Bharathi Raju, CGSC for UOI in item no. 102.

Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with

Mr. Pratyush Miglani and Mr. Shubham Nanda, Advs. for UOI in item no. 113.
Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Rajesh Kumar and Mr. Puneet Yadav, Advs. for UOI in item no. 88.
Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Jitesh V. Srivastava and Mr. Rajesh V. Srivastava, Advs. for UOI in item no. 117 and 120.
Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with with Mr. Vinod Diwakar, CGSC with Mr. Vishal Singh and Ms. Riya Dhingra, Adv. for UOI in item no. 115.
Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Kavindra Gill, Adv. for UOI in item no. 107.
Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel with Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahay, CGSC for UOI in item no. 125.
Mr. L. M. Acharya, Special Counsel for respondent UOI in item nos. 246 to 248.
Mr. Anil Soni, Standing Counsel for R2/AICTE in item nos. 2, 4 to 56, 76 to 230 and 246 to 248.
Mr. Neeraj Verma, Adv. for respondent / NIT Delhi in item nos. 2, 4 to 56, 76 to 230 and 246 to 248.
Mr. Apoorv Kurup and Ms. Vartika Mishra, Advs. for UGC in item nos. 101 and 230.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER
15.03.2021

%

Exemptions, if any, in these petitions are allowed subject to all just exceptions. Application (s) stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 3300/2021

W.P.(C) 3302/2021

W.P.(C) 3314/2021

1. These are fresh petitions, filed by the petitioners. Notice, Mr. L.M. Acharya, Special Counsel accepts notice for respondent / UOI. Mr. Anil Soni, Standing Counsel accepts notice for respondent/AICTE and Mr. Neeraj Verma, Adv. accepts notice for respondent / NIT.

2. As the issue in these three writ petitions is similar to the issue which falls for consideration in connected batch of writ petitions, they are also heard and decided together, vide this common judgment.

3. In terms of order dated February 16, 2021, it was directed that W.P.(C) 9647/2021 shall be the lead writ petition. So, the facts / pleadings in the said writ petition are being narrated for deciding these petitions.

W.P.(C) 9647/2020

4. The prayer as made in petition are the following:

“For the facts and circumstances stated in the accompanying writ petition, it is most, therefore, most respectfully prayed that this Hon’ble Court may be graciously pleased to: -

a. Direct the respondent to allow the petitioner to continue in service on the post of “Assistant Professor” and also pay him regular salary / remuneration, during the pendency of instant writ petition, in the interest of justice;

b. To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to allow the petitioner to continue on the post of “Associate Professor” till regular selection is held and finalized for the said post;

c. To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the Respondents to allow the petitioner to perform the duties attached to the post of “Assistant Professor” and further pay him regular salary / remuneration, as and when the same becomes dues as per AICTE Rules and Regulations;

d. Pass such other / further order / orders or direction / directions as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and appropriate on the facts and circumstances of the case."

5. Suffice to state the aforesaid are the prayers in all the writ petitions.

6. The facts as noted from the record are, that during 1980s, the Government of India and the State Governments had felt the need for revamping the Technician Education System in the country to make it demand-driven with relevant courses in new and emerging technologies, with adequate infrastructure resources, competent faculty and effective teaching-learning processes. The Government of India supported 25 State Governments and Union Territories of Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Puducherry through three Technician Education Projects during 1991-2007, financed by the World Bank, which helped to strengthen and upgrade the system and benefitted 552 polytechnics.

7. It is the case of the petitioner and so contended by Mr. Jayant Mehta, that the success of these projects encouraged the Government of India and the State Governments to seek more funding from the World Bank for systemic transformation of the Technical Education system with focus on Degree level Engineering Education. In 2002-03, the Government of India with financial assistance from the World Bank launched a "*Technical Education Quality Improvement Programme (TEQIP)*" as a long-term programme, to be implemented in three phases for systemic transformation of the Technical Education System.

8. He submits that the first phase of TEQIP commenced in March 2003 and ended in March, 2009, benefitting 127 institutions in 13 States. This project covered less than 10% of the institutions that existed then. The

second phase of Technical Education Quality Improvement Programme (TEQIP-II) commenced in 2009 and lasted till March 2017. The programme was designed to meet the following objectives:

1. Strengthening Institutions to produce high quality Engineers for better Employability.
 2. Scaling-up Postgraduate Education and demand-driven Research & Development and Innovation.
 3. Establishing Centers of Excellence for focussed thematic research
 4. Training of Faculty for effective Teaching.
 5. Enhancing Institutional and System Management effectiveness
 6. Capacity Building to Strengthen Management.
9. Thereafter, the Government of India took up the challenge of next phase, which was third phase of Technical Education Quality Improvement programme (referred to as TEQIP-III) which is fully integrated with the Twelfth Five-year plan objectives for Technical Education as a key component for improving the quality of Engineering Education in existing institutions with a special consideration for Low Income States and Special Category States and support to strengthen few affiliated technical universities to improve their policy, academic and management practices. This is where the induction of these petitioner(s) take place.
10. Mr. Mehta states, according to the Government of India, the Project is to focus on Improving quality and equity in engineering institutions in focus states viz. Low Income States (LIS), eight states in the North-East of India, three Hill states viz. Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Uttarakhand and Andaman and Nicobar Islands (a union territory (UT)).

11. It is the case of the petitioner that only the Government and Government aided AICTE approved Engineering institutions / Engineering faculty / Engineering Teaching Department / Constituent Institutions of Universities / deemed to be Universities and new centrally funded institutions in special category states, are part of the project. An estimated 200 Government and Government funded Engineering institutions including Affiliating Technical Universities (ATUs) are selected under different sub-components in one or two cycles. The project is implemented through the Ministry of Human Resources Development (MHRD) of the Government of India as a Central Sector Scheme (CSS), wherein 100% funds were provided as grants to the States and Union Territories. The LIS States are Bihar, Chattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. The TEQIP III Programme is envisaged to enhance the quality and equity in participating engineering education institutions and improve the efficiency of the engineering education system in focus states. The project support two components:

Component 1: Improving quality and equity in engineering institutions in focus states.

Sub-component 1.1: Institutional Development for Participating Institutions.

12. The project has a focus in improvement of Teaching, Learning and Research competence. Improve student learning, Student employability, Increasing faculty productivity and motivation, Establishing a twinning system.

13. The success of TEQIP I and II has established the World Bank's role in supporting ambitious reform-driven projects in engineering education in

India. The Bank's engagement in TEQIP I and TEQIP II has also helped it build key networks, within project institutes as well as top-ranking Indian engineering and management institutes, which have been leveraged to initiate a range of quality and governance improved efforts within project institutes. These networks plays an important role in both helping TEQIP III achieve its objectives, and sustaining the reforms undertaken in the TEQIP series. The Bank continues to incorporate lessons from projects in other parts of the world. As per the programming design, improving teacher effectiveness will require several measures including the following:

- a. Updating Domain Knowledge to enable faculty members keep abreast of latest developments in domain knowledge.
- b. Training in Pedagogy will support teachers in select undergraduate institutions to undertake refresher training in pedagogy to enhance their effectiveness.
- c. Fostering Positive Teacher Behaviour will involve behavioural training to the teachers to enhance their self-understanding, improve their sensitivity, leadership and management skills. A third important area for improvement of teacher performance is their behaviour toward students (especially weak ones). An important 'first resort' is to counsel teachers who show bad behaviours, help and guide them. Besides having a formal Counsellor, Faculty Mentoring programme could be introduced to help faculty members that are younger and may seek help.

14. Mr. Mehta submits that the faculty training Institutions are expected to encourage faculty to upgrade their qualification from Bachelors to Masters and from Masters to Doctoral degree. If the facilities are available

within the institution, the same need to be maximally utilized. Alternatively, the faculty could be deputed to other institutions (within India) for enhancement of qualification. Part-time or sandwich programmes are used wherever feasible and necessary. Subject upgradation and research competence is to make the faculty aware of the advances in knowledge, technologies, and research methodologies for improving his / her own performance and for the benefit of student.

15. He submits, the teachers selected were granted approximately 396 CRS projects by NPIU out of their own mettle and intellect. They put all hard work to make a research product at the working institute. While many other research projects take 2-3 years they are given 1 year 3 months to complete it due to the closure of the Project.

16. He submits, the GATE, measuring the quality of graduating engineers has seen a passing rate of 31% from the sampled TEQIP institutes providing training, learning material and support to students under TEQIP. Under TEQIP-III, 80.21% of participating institutes in focus states train final year engineering students to take GATE. That faculty recruitment through TEQIP-III has been a boon for the institutes, which initially had a very low student – faculty ratio. This was helpful in preparing the institutes for NBA accreditation and ensuring better academic support for students. That all the significant changes implemented through TEQIP-III require a plan for sustenance, which was missing in most of the institutes. A sudden withdrawal of support would adversely impact the reforms undertaken by the institutes, which would eventually defeat the purpose of the project. That in order to implement the Project under TEQIP a memorandum of understanding was executed between All India Council for Technical

Education (herein after referred to as “AICTE”) and National Project Implementation Unit (NPIU) New Delhi with an objective that the said memorandum of understanding (MoU) is to implement various activities for the benefit of project institutes, which fall under TEQIP.

17. In the above background, he contends an advertisement was issued by the National Project Implementation Unit calling for applications for appointment to the post of Assistant Professor on contract basis for Engineering Colleges under the TEQIP Project. The advertisement stated that the appointment is up to 3 years with emoluments of Rs.70,000/- per month and number of posts available being 1221 in 53 Colleges and the interviews to be held in 20 NITs as per the choice of the candidates. Pursuant to the advertisement all the petitioners herein have applied for appointment as Assistant Professors. Being successful in the selection process, the engagement offer was issued to each of the petitioners. The engagement offer as issued to the petitioner in this petition by the Jorhat Engineering College in Assam, contemplates that the appointment is as Assistant Professor on temporary basis for TEQIP (III), the World Bank assisted project.

18. It is the submission of Mr. Mehta, that the intention of the project is to improve the technical education in the Country which is a long drawn process and as the objective has not been achieved, it is in the larger public interest that the project must be continued. He also states that the petitioners having brilliant academic record and it is in the interest of the institute concerned that the expertise of the petitioners are used for enhancement of the technical education in the country. He would rely upon the Judgments as reported in the case of *Karnataka State Private College Stop-Gap*

Lecturers Association v. State of Karnataka (connected with) B.R. Parineeth and Ors. v. State of Karnataka, 1992 4 SCC 29 & State of Karnataka v. Uma Devi , 2006 (4) SCC.

19. On the other hand, Mr. L.M. Acharya, learned Special Counsel appearing for the respondent No.1 at the outset raised an issue of maintainability of these petitions in this Court inasmuch as all the petitioners in these batch of petitions have been engaged outside Delhi and any prayer seeking continuation / regularization must be against the institutes in which they are working, as no cause of action has arisen within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court, and the petition is liable to be dismissed on this ground only. That apart, he submits that the entire process of centralized engagement of, project based temporary faculty as Assistant Professor was initiated by the Ministry of Education through NPIU on behalf and after consent of the respective institutes / State Governments. The engagement of project based temporary faculty is to fulfil the faculty requirement of the participating institute for seeking accreditation from the National Board of Accreditation. Such institutes / States expressed their inability to recruit faculty on regular basis. This in turn would enable the participating institute to seek aid under the aforementioned TCQIP-III Project initiated jointly by the Government of India and World Bank. Thus the engagement of project based temporary faculty through the above centralized engagement process does not seek to create any new teaching posts in the institute but is merely a project related and as such engagement would come to an end automatically upon completion of the project. According to him, MHRD / NPIU merely acted as facilitator for identification of these faculties on behalf of the State / Institute and the faculties are engaged by the

respective Institutes only. The engagement offers are also issued by the respective institutes only. The project only supports the monthly remuneration of these project faculties till the closure of the project, i.e., March 31, 2021. Moreover, the Govt. of India will no longer be able to fund the Institute for remuneration of the project based temporary faculties as soon as the externally aided project comes to an end because the World Bank will not fund the project beyond the project period. Therefore, the decision on sustainability of these faculties beyond the project period has to be taken by their authority, i.e., the respective institutes, where the faculties are working or the State Governments on behalf of the institute. He also on instructions from Ms. Renuka Mishra, Director (Education), Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Education (Govt. of India) states, it has been decided by the World Bank that the World Bank is not funding the Project after March 31, 2021 and the project unit shall be disbanded after the settlement of accounts. That apart, he states, this project was started in 2002-2003 and the same has been implemented in phased manner. Phase-I and Phase-II were with regard to identified states. Similarly, Phase-III is with regard to certain identified states and petitioners have been appointed in Govt. / Govt. aided institutes in the identified states. The terms of appointment issued to the petitioners in this batch of writ petitions are very clear that the faculty, i.e., petitioners shall serve the Colleges on temporary basis for TEQIP-III, the World Bank assisted project, between the period April 1, 2017 to March 31, 2020, but because of the COVID, now the date has been extended till March 31, 2021. It is also clearly stated that the petitioners shall be the project related staff and in view of the terms of the appointment given to the petitioners they have no right to seek regularization

and continue to work in the College as regular employee. In other words, it is his submission that the petitioners got the employment in the Institute only because of the Project and their continuance as a faculty in the College is till the lifetime of the Project, which is going to expire on March 31, 2021 and cannot be continued. He submits, some of the petitioners have given undertaking that they shall not claim regularization or permanency against the respondents. They now cannot turn back and demand continuance / regularization, as sought in these petitions. That apart, he has also drawn my attention to the letter dated September 17, 2019 of the NPIU written to one of the faculties, wherein it has been decided to advice CFTIs to consider the work experience of the Assistant Professors and also treat the monthly remuneration of TEQIP faculties equivalent to relevant AICTE pay scale during the faculty selections. He has relied upon the Judgment in the case of ***Mohd. Abdul Qadir and Ors. v. Director General of Police, Assam and Ors. 2009 6 SCC 611*** to contend that if the temporary or ad-hoc engagement or appointment is in connection with a particular project or a specific scheme, the *ad hoc* or temporary service of the persons employed under the Project or Scheme would come to an end, on completion/closure/cessation of the Project or the Scheme. In the case in hand, the project for TEQIP being only for a period of three years during which period the petitioners have been appointed and the Project is coming to an end on March 31, 2021, the petitioners who were engaged with reference to or in connection with such Project cannot claim any right in service or seek regularization. He seeks the dismissal of these writ petitions. Mr. Neeraj Verma, learned counsel appearing for NIT, Delhi submits that no appointment has been made in NIT, Delhi. The other counsels appearing in the writ petitions for

the petitioners and also for respondents adopt the submissions made by Mr. Mehta and Mr. Acharya.

20. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, the only issue which arises for consideration is whether the petitioners are entitled to the reliefs as prayed for.

21. There is no dispute that the petitioners' appointment was with regard to a project (TEQIP-III) started on the basis of the funding made by the World Bank. The purpose of the Project is very clear to improve the technical education in the country and the same is to be achieved by appointing faculties in different Govt. / Govt. funded institutes. The terms of appointment of the petitioners are very clear that the same is temporary for a period of three years. It is the case of the respondent No.1 that the World Bank has decided not to fund the Project beyond March 31, 2021 and pursuant thereto the Project Unit shall be disbanded. In other words, the Project for which the petitioners are working would no more exist. The very basis of employment of the petitioners shall cease to exist. If that be so, the appointment of the petitioners shall also be discontinued. The petitioners being Project employees, cannot continue beyond the project life, i.e., March 31, 2021. The plea of Mr. Mehta is that the posts being in existence, the petitioners need to be continued. I am not in agreement with the said submission for the reason, the posts on which the petitioners are working were created for the purpose of the project namely TEQIP-III and are called the project posts and shall with the disbanding of the project, ceases to exist. The plea of Mr. Mehta, that the objective of the Project being perennial in nature, the same need to be continued is also not appealing as (1) the project is funded by the World Bank, who has decided to stop the funding and in the

absence of the same, project has to be discontinued (2) it is for the authorities and not for the Court to decide, whether the project has to be continued or not.

22. Insofar as the reliance placed by Mr. Mehta on the judgments in the case of *Karnataka State Private College Stop Gap Lecturers Association (supra)*, *State of Karnataka v. Uma Devi (supra)* are concerned, the same have no applicability in the facts of this case, inasmuch as (i) the employees in the aforesaid judgments were engaged in the regular establishment but on *ad hoc* / temporary / contractual basis and not in a project that too funded by an outstanding agency for limited duration. (ii) The employees in those cases have worked for a longer duration unlike in the case in hand where the petitioners have been engaged for the last three years and which appointment is co-terminus with the project and (iii) in *Uma Devi (supra)*, the Supreme Court has held that appointments can be made by the Government or authority against sanctioned posts; vacancies in sanctioned posts; through open competition; by persons having eligibility in terms of the recruitment rules. None of the conditions are fulfilled when engagement is in a project, of a limited duration and funded by an outside agency.

23. The learned counsel for the respondent No.1 is justified in relying upon the Judgment in the case of *Mohd. Abdul Qadir and Ors. (supra)* wherein in Para 13 to 15, the Supreme Court has held as under:

“13. The fact that the appellants were employed under the PIF Additional Scheme is not disputed. The duration of PIF Additional Scheme under which they are employed was initially two years, to be reviewed for continuation along with the original PIF Scheme. The said scheme is being extended from time to time and is being continued. If the temporary or ad-hoc

engagement or appointment is in connection with a particular project or a specific scheme, the ad hoc or temporary service of the persons employed under the Project or Scheme would come to an end, on completion/closure/cessation of the Project or the Scheme.

14. The fact that the Scheme had been in operation for some decades or that the employee concerned has continued on ad hoc basis for one or two decades would not entitle the employee to seek permanency or regularization. Even if any posts are sanctioned with reference to the Scheme, such sanction is of ad hoc or temporary posts co-terminus with the scheme and not of permanent posts.

15. On completion of the project or discontinuance of the scheme, those who were engaged with reference to or in connection with such Project or Scheme cannot claim any right to continue in service, nor seek regularization in some other project or service. (See Bhagwan Dass v. State of Haryana - 1987 (4) SCC 634, Delhi Development Horticulture Employees Union v. Delhi Administration - 1992 (4) SCC 99, Hindustan Steel Works Construction Ltd., vs. Employees Union - 1995 (3) SCC 474, UP Land Development Corporation vs. Amar Singh - 2003 (5) SCC 388, Madhyamik Shiksha Parishad UP v. Anil Kumar Mishra - 2005 (5) SCC 122, Secretary, State of Karnataka v. Umadevi - 2006 (4) SCC 31, Indian Council of Medical Research vs. K. Rajyalakshmi - 2007 (2) SCC 332, and Lal Mohammed vs. Indian Railway Construction Co. Ltd. - 2007 (2) SCC 513). In view of this settled position, the appellants will not be entitled to regularization."

24. These petitions are squarely covered by the ratio of the Judgment in the case of **Mohd. Abdul Qadir (supra)** and the petitioners are not entitled to their continuance on the post of Assistant Professor with benefits of a regular employee.

25. I do not see any merit in these petitions. The same are dismissed. I take on record the stand of respondent No.1 that it shall advise CFTIs to consider the work experience of the petitioners as Assistant Professors (TEQIP) Faculty and also treat the monthly remuneration of these Assistant Professors equivalent to relevant AICTE pay scale, as stated in the letter dated September 17, 2019. No costs.

26. Registry is directed to place photocopy of this order in all the petitions.

27. Pending application (s), if any are dismissed as infructuous.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MARCH 15, 2021/jg