



\$~68

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

+ W.P.(C) 14458/2025

DEEPAK

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. A. K. Trivedi and Mr.
Vaibhav Trivedi, Advs.

versus

UOI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh
Rudy, CGSC along with Ms.
Usha Jamnal, Ms. Nyasa
Sharma, and Mr. Ankit Khatri,
Advs. for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

15.04.2026

1. By way of the present Petition, the Petitioner seeks issuance of a writ in the nature of *Mandamus* for quashing and setting aside the order dated 30.08.2025 whereby the Petitioner has been dismissed from service.
2. The Petitioner's provisional appointment came to be cancelled on the ground that the trade certificate submitted by him for securing appointment was issued by an institute which was not recognised. The Petitioner had relied upon a trade certificate issued by *Gramin Rojgar Koshal Vikas Centre* ('GRKVC'), from where he claims to have completed a Diploma in Cooking. The certificate records that the institute was a training provider under the National Skill India Development Corporation ('NSDC') Skill India.
3. On the basis of the aforesaid certificate, the Petitioner was granted provisional appointment, subject to verification. Upon verification, it was found that the said institute was neither recognised



nor approved by NSDC Skill India. Consequently, the services of the Petitioner were terminated.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner has subsequently completed the course from a recognised institute and that he was not at fault. He further submits that termination of the Petitioner's services would entail disqualification from future appointments.

5. This Court has considered the submissions and is of the view that the present case pertains to cancellation of appointment and not termination of service. Accordingly, the order dated 30.08.2025 shall be construed as an order of cancellation of appointment and not termination.

6. Insofar as the contention regarding the absence of fault on the part of the Petitioner is concerned, it is evident that the Petitioner had obtained the Diploma from an unrecognised institute, whereas the recruitment notice specifically required the trade certificate to be issued by a recognised institute.

7. Subsequent completion of the course from a recognised institute cannot cure the defect existing on the date of appointment. Since the Petitioner's appointment stands cancelled, he shall be at liberty, if so advised, to participate in future recruitment processes in accordance with law.

8. In view of the aforesaid, the present Petition is dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

APRIL 15, 2026
s.godara/shah