

**Deepak vs Uoi and Ors.**

**Deepak vs Uoi and Ors.**

**SooperKanoon Citation :** [sooperkanoon.com/1271155](https://sooperkanoon.com/1271155)

**Court :** Delhi

**Decided On :** Apr-15-2026

**Judge :** Hon'Ble Mr. Justice Amit Mahajan,Hon'Ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal

**Appeal No. :** W.P.(C)/14458/2025

**Appellant :** Deepak

**Respondent :** Uoi and Ors.

**Advocate for Def. :** Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy, Ms. Usha Jamnal, Ms. Nyasa Sharma, Mr. Ankit Khatri

**Advocate for Pet/Ap. :** Mr. A. K. Trivedi, Mr. Vaibhav Trivedi

**Judgement :**

\* 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, Adv. 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 Petitioners 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 Petitioners 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 Petitioners 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

**SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - [sooperkanoon.com](http://sooperkanoon.com)**