



\$~1

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4842/2025**

SH. MRIDUL RAWAT

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Rashmi Chopra, Senior
Advocate with Ms. Fiza Chopra
and Mr. Puneet Rathi, Advocates.

versus

**DELHI SKILL AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP UNIVERSITY
(DSEU) AND OTHERS**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Shivendra Singh and Ms.
Prakirti Rastogi, Advocates for R-
1.
Ms. Latika Chaudhary, Advocate
for R-2&3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **21.05.2025**

1. Issue notice. Mr. Shivendra Singh, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1–Delhi Skill and Entrepreneurship University [“University”], and Ms. Latika Chaudhary, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 2 and 3.
2. The petitioner has filed this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, challenging an order dated 15.01.2025, issued by the University, by which his contractual employment was not extended.
3. The petitioner was engaged as a Lecturer in the year 2012, first by the Department of Training and Technical Education, GNCTD, and subsequently transferred to the University, upon integration of ten institutes of technology in the year 2021. His services have subsequently been extended, lastly until 30.04.2024. He was informed in July 2024 that



his services were not being extended again. The petitioner, thereafter, approached this Court, by way of W.P.(C) 15216/2024, which was disposed of on 29.10.2024, with a direction upon the University to take a decision with regard to contract and/or regularisation of his services within a period of four weeks. The impugned order dated 15.01.2025 rejected the petitioner's representation. The said order includes allegations of unauthorised absence and abandonment of duty.

4. The present writ petition was first listed on 17.04.2025, when Ms. Rashmi Chopra, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, sought time to place judgments in support of her contention that the University was obliged to hold an inquiry before a decision was taken not to extend the petitioner's services.

5. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, Ms. Chopra relis upon a judgment of the Supreme Court in *K. Ragupathi v. State of U.P.* [(2022) 6 SCC 346], to submit that a contractual employee is also entitled to a show cause notice and hearing, if his contract is not extended or terminated on allegations of misconduct.

6. Counter affidavits may be filed within four weeks. Rejoinders thereto, if any, may be filed within two weeks thereafter.

7. List before learned Registrar on 13.08.2025, for completion of pleadings.

8. List before Court on 28.11.2025.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 21, 2025/UK/AD/