



\$~120

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

+ W.P.(C) 13516/2025 & CM APPL. 55465/2025

SRI SANT LOCHAN PRIVATE ITI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Mayank Manish, Mr. Ravi Kant,
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay, Mr. Jayant
Dubey and Mr. Ayush Aanand, Advs.

versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TRAINING

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Akash Chatterjee, SPC for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

10.09.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed assailing the decision of the Standing Committee taken in its 22nd meeting dated 16.06.2025 which was uploaded under the cover of the respondent's communication dated 06.08.2025.
2. Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner institute is an Industrial Training Institute, duly recognized by the respondent *vide* order dated 08.11.2017, for Electrician 4 (2+2) and Fitter 4 (2+2) Trades.
3. He submits that the petitioner ITI was designated as exam centre for AITT exams which was held in August, 2024. The flying squad visited the ITI on day of practical exam dated 12.08.2024, and during the said visit, certain deficiencies were observed.



4. Sequel to above, the respondents gave show cause notice dated 04.09.2024 to the present petitioner, which was replied by the petitioner *vide* its reply dated 10.09.2024.
5. He submits that considering the reply of the petitioner *vide* letter dated 10.09.2024, a Joint Inspection of the petitioner institute was conducted on 21.01.2025 by the State and Regional Directorate of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship (RDSDE) Officials. During the inspection again certain deficiencies were noted.
6. He submits that the Standing Committee on Accreditation and Affiliation (SCAA) however, took an impugned decision and decided to disaffiliate the petitioner institute after recording the observation/recommendations of the State Skill Development & Entrepreneurship Committee (SSDEC) that the petitioner ITI did not reply to the show cause notice dated 31.01.2025 and reminder dated 05.03.2025 issued by the State Directorate.
7. He submits that no show cause notice dated 31.01.2025 was served upon the petitioner. However, the petitioner only received reminder dated 05.03.2025.
8. Mr. Sharawat invites attention of the Court to the communication dated 20.03.2025 *vide* which show-cause notice/reminder was duly replied by the petitioner institute within a period stipulated in the reminder, however, it has been wrongly recorded that reply has not been given by the petitioner. He submits that the said communication also bears acknowledgment stamp of the State Directorate.
9. He submits that petitioner is confining its submission only to the limited relief that the reply of the petitioner may be considered by the SCAA



and fresh order be passed.

10. Mr. Chatterjee, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent, however, contends that the respondent has constituted an online grievance redressal mechanism and has constituted a Committee for the same, which can be approached by the petitioner.

11. However, having regard to the fact that the meaningful opportunity has not been afforded to the petitioner in terms of principles of natural justice, before passing the impugned order of disaffiliation, inasmuch as SCAA has overlooked the reply filed by the petitioner and wrongly recorded that no reply was filed, this Court is of the view that the impugned decision cannot be sustained.

12. Accordingly, the impugned decision dated 16.06.2025 is set aside and the matter is remanded to SCAA to pass a fresh order after considering the aforesaid reply dated 20.03.2025 of the petitioner.

13. In case any documents are required by the respondent SCAA from the petitioner, it shall be at liberty to ask for the same from the petitioner.

14. Let fresh order be passed within a period of four weeks.

15. The petition alongwith pending application is disposed of in the above terms.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 10, 2025

N.S. ASWAL