



\$~20

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ LPA 723/2025, CM APPL. 75217/2025, CM APPL. 75218/2025 & CM APPL. 75219/2025

IILM, LODHI ROAD DELHIAppellant
Through: Ms. Srishty Kaul and Ms. Navita,
Advocates.
versus

SAMARVEER SINGH & ANR.Respondents
Through: Mr. Akhil Suri, Mr. Ritik Malik and Mr.
Udit Thukran, Advocates for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER
01.12.2025

%

1. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
2. This intra-Court appeal takes an exception to an interim order dated 14.10.2025 passed by learned Single Judge in the writ petition filed by respondent, namely W.P.(C) No.14207/2025, whereby the appellant-Institute has been directed to allow the respondent to attend the classes and his official e-mail ID has also been directed to be activated.
3. The reason given by the learned Single Judge is that in terms of the vaping policy of the appellant, in case of the first offence, the punishment of written warning is to be inflicted followed by a monetary penalty of Rs.5,000/- and suspension for a period of seven working days along with a written apology. For the second offence, the punishment that could be awarded is a fine of Rs.10,000/- and a suspension for fifteen days. The vaping policy further prescribes that it is only the third offence, which may entail immediate rustication from the college.



4. Learned counsel for the appellant could not bring on record any material to infer that the instant case is a case of the third offence. She has submitted that in the first offence, the respondent was caught cheating, however on tendering the apology, no further action was taken and therefore, it is the second offence. However, as per the policy, it is only the third offence which may lead to immediate rustication from the college. Admittedly, the instant case is not where the respondent has been punished for the third offence. It is also to be noticed that it has rather been admitted by the appellant that the vaping policy does not include cheating.

5. For the aforesaid reasons, we do not find any good reason to interfere with the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge. The appeal is accordingly, hereby dismissed.

6. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

DECEMBER 1, 2025

Sumit