



\$~77.

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **LPA 655/2025**

ARYANS COLLEGE OF EDUCATIONAppellant

Through: Mr. Rishabh Kumar, Adv.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S Rupal, Mr. Hardik
Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra and
Ms. Tripta Sharma, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER

% **29.10.2025**

CM APPL. 67191/2025

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

LPA 655/2025 & CM APPL. 67189/2025, CM APPL. 67190/2025

1. This Letters Patent Appeal intends to challenge the judgment dated 07.10.2024, passed by the learned Single Judge whereby W.P.(C) 14153/2024 filed by the appellant was dismissed.
2. There is a delay of 356 days in filing the appeal.
3. An application seeking condonation of delay i.e. CM APPL. 67189/2025 has been filed wherein it has been stated that limitation to challenge the order passed by the learned Single Judge by filing an intra-Court appeal expired on 06.11.2024 and further that management of the appellant institution took some time in deciding to challenge the order dated 07.10.2024. It is further stated in the application that a representation thereafter was made on 21.04.2025 with the respondent No.1 for redressal of the grievances and thereafter writ petition being W.P.(C) 13312/ 2025 was filed which was dismissed as withdrawn vide



order dated 18.09.2025 with the observation that the appellant may prefer an intra-Court appeal against the earlier order passed by the learned Single Judge on 07.10.2024.

4. In the entire application, no satisfactory explanation comes forth which can persuade us to condone the delay. The judgment which is sought to be challenged was rendered by the learned Single Judge on 07.10.2024 and the representation is said to have been made by the appellant on 21.04.2025 after expiry of a period of about 06 months from the date the earlier writ petition was decided by the learned Single Judge. Thus, for this 06 months period no explanation has been given as to why the appellant did not prefer the appeal or filed a writ petition before the jurisdictional High Court in view of the order dated 07.10.2024 whereby the earlier writ petition filed by the appellant was dismissed on the ground of “*forum conveniens*”.

5. If the appellant was aggrieved in any manner by the order dated 07.10.2024, he ought to have instituted the intra-Court appeal within a reasonable time or else the other course available to the appellant was to file the petition before the jurisdictional High Court. The appellant completely failed to either file the LPA within time or the writ petition before the jurisdictional High Court. The explanation sought to be submitted in the application seeking condonation of delay thus, does not appear to be sufficient. Accordingly, the application seeking condonation of delay is rejected. Consequently, the appeal is also dismissed.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

OCTOBER 29, 2025

N.Khanna