



\$~12 to 14

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

+ W.P.(C) 12016/2018, CM APPL. 46545/2018, CM APPL. 38936/2019 & CM APPL. 50883/2022

YOGESH KUMAR SHARMAPetitioner

versus

ALL INDIA COUNCIL FOR TECHNICAL EDUCATION
(AICTE) AND ORS.Respondents

+ W.P.(C) 12017/2018, CM APPL. 46547/2018 & 50901/2022

SATYAPAL SINGHPetitioner

versus

ALL INDIA COUNCIL FOR TECHNICAL EDUCATION
(AICTE) AND ORS.Respondents

+ W.P.(C) 12029/2018, CM APPL. 46570/2018 & 50881/2022

TRUPTI MILAN PUROHITPetitioner

versus

ALL INDIA COUNCIL FOR TECHNICAL EDUCATION
(AICTE) AND ORS.Respondents

Appearance:

Mr. Mayank Mikhail Mukherjee and Mr. Ujjwal Singh, Advocates for petitioners.

Ms. Avnish Ahlawat, SC for GNCTD with Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms. Laavanya Kaushik, Ms. Aliza Alam, Mr. Amitoj Chadha and Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat, Advocates.

Mr. Gaurav Dhingra and Mr. Shashank Singh, Advocates for DTTE.

Ms. Seema Dolo, Advocate for DU in Item No.13.



Mr. Anil Soni, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Devvrat Yadav and Mr. Kush Garg, Advocates for AICTE.

Mr. Abinash Kumar Mishra Advocate for R-3 and 4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

15.05.2025

1. Pursuant to the order dated 09.05.2025, Mr. Mayank Mikhail Mukherjee, learned counsel for the petitioners, seeks permission to withdraw these writ petitions with liberty to file appeals before the learned District Judge under Section 32 of the Delhi Sikh Gurdwaras Act, 1971.

2. My attention has also been drawn to a judgment of the Division Bench in *Kawaljeet Singh & Ors. vs. Guru Nanak Institute of Management and Information Technology & Ors* [LPA 386/2024 and connected matters; decided on 28.02.2025], wherein the following directions were issued, in similar circumstances:

“14. However, keeping in mind the fact that these writ petitions were in fact pending before the learned Single Judge for a considerable period of time, we dispense with the requirement of the appellants having to file fresh appeals before learned District Judge. They would be entitled to present these writ petitions along with record of this Court before the concerned District judge who would treat them as appeals and decide them accordingly.

15. We may note that learned Counsel for the respondents has fairly consented to this.

16. We request the learned District Judge to decide the writ petitions filed before this Court, treating them as petitions under Section 32(d) of the DSG Act as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of six months from the date when the matters are presented before the learned District Judge.

17. Needless to say, should the appellants remain aggrieved by the



decision of the District Judge, their rights to challenge the decision as available in law would stand reserved.

xxx

xxx

xxx

20. For this purpose, the record of the writ petitions in electronic form would be provided to learned Counsel for both sides and appellants would be at liberty to present the said writ petitions before the concerned District Judge who would deal with them appropriately.”

3. The present writ petitions are also dismissed as withdrawn, with liberty as aforesaid, and with directions in same terms, as extracted above.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 15, 2025
SS/SD/