



\$~71 and 72

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

+ W.P.(C) 3071/2025

AJAY KUMAR KATARIA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Umesh Sharma, Mr. Vikas
Nagwan and Mr. Ritesh Kumar
Kaushik, Advocates.

versus

NETAJI SUBHASH UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

.....Respondent

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, Standing
Counsel with Mr. N.K. Singh,
Ms.Laavanya Kaushik,
Mr.Mohnish Sehrawat and
Mr.Amitaj Chadha, Advocates.

+ W.P.(C) 3118/2025

AKANKSHA KULSHRESHTHA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Umesh Sharma, Mr. Vikas
Nagwan and Mr. Ritesh Kumar
Kaushik, Advocates.

versus

NETAJI SUBHASH UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

.....Respondent

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, Standing
Counsel with Mr. N.K. Singh,
Ms.Laavanya Kaushik,
Mr.Mohnish Sehrawat and
Mr.Amitaj Chadha, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

12.03.2025

CM APPL.14508/2025 (Exemption) in W.P.(C) 3071/2025

CM APPL.14768/2025 (Exemption) in W.P.(C) 3118/2025

Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The applications stand disposed of.



W.P.(C) 3071/2025 and CM APPL.14507/2025

W.P.(C) 3118/2025 and CM APPL.14767/2025

1. Issue notice. Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, learned Standing Counsel, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-Netaji Subhash University of Technology [“NSUT”].
2. The petitioners have filed these writ petitions seeking a direction upon NSUT to regularise their services alongwith consequential benefits from the date of their appointment.
3. The petitioners have been employed in NSUT in the post of Assistant Professors in the Bio-Technology department on contractual basis since 2014, pursuant to an advertisement issued in the year 2012.
4. Mr. Umesh Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioners, relies upon a judgment of this Court in *Apoorvi Sood v. Netaji Subhas Institute of Technology & Anr. and connected matter* [W.P.(C) No.10664/2018, decided on 26.09.2024], where petitions filed by similarly placed employees seeking similar reliefs were allowed. In the said judgment, NSUT was directed to treat the appointments in question as regular or permanent and grant them all consequential benefits. The operative directions in the said judgment are as follows:-

“15. Accordingly, these writ petitions are allowed directing NSIT to treat the appointments of the Petitioners as regular and permanent and grant them all consequential benefits as they have been working continuously and without a break on account of an assurance given to the Court on 10.10.2018 by the learned counsel for NSIT, on instructions, that services of the Petitioners would not be terminated and the interim order has continued. Pending applications also stand disposed of.”

5. Mrs. Ahlawat does not dispute that the position of the present petitioners is similar. However, she submits that the judgment dated



26.09.2024 has been carried in appeal [Diary No. 5810439/2024], but the appeal remains in defects.

6. Having regard to the fact that more than five months have passed since the said judgment was delivered, and the appeals filed by the respondent have not even been listed before the Division Bench yet for the first time, I am of the view that the present petitions can be disposed of on the same basis as the case of *Apoorvi Sood* (supra.).

7. The writ petitions are disposed of, with the direction to the respondent to treat the appointments of the petitioners as regular and permanent, and grant them benefits, in terms of paragraph 15 of the judgment of this Court in *Apoorvi Sood* (supra.).

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MARCH 12, 2025/uk/AD/