



\$~72

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

+ **W.P.(C) 17850/2025 & CM APPL. 73698/2025**

RAM JIYAWAN MEMORIAL PRIVATE ITI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Senior Advocate with Mr. Mayank Manish, Mr Ravi Kant and Mr. Vineet Upadhaya, Advocates.

versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TRAINING

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Kshitij Chhabra, SPC with Ms. Ojaswini, G.P., Mr. Abhijeet Vikram Singh and Mr. Hardik Nain, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

% **26.11.2025**

1. Matter is taken up today as 25.11.2025 has been declared holiday on account of 350th Anniversary of Guru Teg Bahadur's Martyrdom Day.
2. This writ petition is filed on behalf of the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs:-

“(a) quash the letter dated 11/12.09.2024 issued by the Respondent, whereby it has conveyed the “not recommended” decision taken by its SCAA/DGT, in respect of Petitioner's Electrician Trade, applied with 6 Units (2+2+2); and

(b) quash the minutes of the meeting dated 28.11.2024 held by Grievance Redressal Committee of Respondent, whereby it has closed the grievance of the Petitioner, without considering the compliance made by it

(c) direct the respondent to reconsider the compliance/ rectification made by the Petitioner and consequently, recommend/approve the petitioner for Electrician Trade with 6 Units (2+2+2), as applied by the Petitioner.”

3. Issue notice.



4. Mr. Kshitij Chhabra, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the Respondent.
5. Case of the Petitioner is that on 26.08.2010, Petitioner Institute, submitted its application with the Respondent for conducting ITI Trades and the application was accepted granting permission/accreditation to conduct Trades of Electrician [2 (1+1)] and Copa [2 (1+1)] vide decision dated 26.08.2010. Petitioner applied for additional units for Electrician Trades and by decision dated 28.06.2012, further 1 (one) unit was permitted making the number of units as 3.
6. It is stated that in the year 2020, Petitioner submitted an application seeking additional units of Electrician Trade and Fitter Trade. The application was accepted and on 27.09.2022 inspection was carried out by DGT Inspection. However, later it was decided to re-inspect the Institution and reinspection was carried out by the Standing Committee on 13.09.2023. By letter dated 11.09.2024, DGT conveyed the decision taken by SCAA/DGT, wherein recommendation was made for increase of 2 units in the Fitter Trade but the request for increase in Electrician Trade was declined. Petitioner submitted its grievance before the Grievance Redressal Committee ('GRC') and also provided the electricity bill dated 07.10.2024 showing that the sanctioned load of the Institution was 23 KVA against the required load of 20.7 KVA for the purpose of imparting training in the concerned trade, which was a bone of contention between the parties. In its meeting held on 28.11.2024, GRC did not accede to the request of the Petitioner, which according to the Petitioner was in contravention of Office Memorandums dated 16.08.2022 and 15.02.2024, issued by DGT.
7. Mr. Sharawat, learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner, on



instructions, submits that Petitioner will be satisfied at this stage if the matter is remanded back to the Respondent for reconsideration taking into account the documents such as electricity bill etc. filed before GRC for the next academic session 2026-2027. He further submits that several orders have been passed by this Court remanding the matter back for reconsideration and relies on one such order dated 03.12.2020 passed in W.P.(C) 9744/2020.

8. Learned counsel for the Respondent submits that the electricity bill, on which much emphasis is laid by the Petitioner, was not provided during inspection/reinspection and was for the first time provided before GRC and that too for the year 2024 and therefore, no infirmity can be found with the decision taken for the period prior to the bill period, declining increase in the units for Electrician Trade.

9. Heard learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner and learned counsel for the Respondent.

10. Considering the limited relief sought by the Petitioner seeking remand of the matter back to the Respondent for reconsideration, this writ petition is disposed of directing the Respondent to reconsider the application of the Petitioner for increase of units in the Electrician Trade in accordance with Affiliation Norms for ITIs Year-2018 and taking into account the documents furnished by the Petitioner, including electricity bill dated 07.10.2024. The decision will be taken by the Respondent within eight weeks from today and needless to state that it will be open to the Respondent to conduct reinspection of the premises before taking a decision. If any deficiency is found during inspection, the same shall be communicated to the Petitioner and opportunity will be given to explain/rectify the same. It is clarified that



in case a decision is taken to increase the units of Electrician Trade, the increased intake will take effect from the academic session 2026-2027.

11. It is left open to the Petitioner to take recourse to legal remedies, in case of any grievance against the decision taken by the Respondent. It is also made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

12. Pending application stands disposed of.

JYOTI SINGH, J

NOVEMBER 26, 2025

S.Sharma