



\$~95 & 108

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

(95)+ LPA 211/2025

NETAJI SUBHAS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
FORMERLY KNOWN AS NETAJI SUBHAS INSTITUTE OF
TECHNOLOGY & ORS.Appellants

Through: Mr. Sanjay Ghose, Sr. Adv.
with Mr. Rahul Sharma, Mr.
Mani Kant Sharma & Mr.
Mohit Garg, Adv.

versus

APOORVI SOOD & ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Latika Choudhary, Adv.

(108)+ LPA 217/2025

NETAJI SUBHAS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
FORMERLY KNOWN AS NETAJI SUBHAS INSTITUTE OF
TECHNOLOGY & ORS.Appellants

Through: Mr. Sanjay Ghose, Sr. Adv.
with Mr. Rahul Sharma, Mr.
Mani Kant Sharma & Mr.
Mohit Garg, Adv.

versus

DR PRITI BANSAL & ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Latika Choudhary, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

ORDER

% **25.03.2025**

CM APPLs. 17056-57/2025 (Exemption) In LPA 211/2025



CM APPLs. 17290-91/2025 (Exemption) In LPA 217/2025

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CM APPL. 17058/2025 In In LPA 211/2025

CM APPL. 17292/2025 In LPA 217/2025

2. For the reasons stated in the application, the delay of 53 days in re-filing of the appeal is condoned.
3. The application stands disposed of.

CM APPL. 17055/2025 In LPA 211/2025

CM APPL. 17289/2025 In LPA 217/2025

4. These applications have been filed by the appellants, challenging the Order dated 26.09.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in WP(C) NO. 10664/ 2018 titled as “***Apoorvi Sood v. Netaji Subhas Institute of Technology and Ors.***”; and W.P.(C) 10668/2018 titled as “***Dr. Priti Bansal v. Netaji Subhas Institute of Technology and Ors.***”, whereby, the learned Single Judge allowed the writ petitions filed by the respective respondent No.1 and directed the appellant to treat the appointment of the said respondents as regular and permanent and grant them all consequential benefits as they have been working continuously and without a break on account of an assurance given to the learned Single Judge on 10.10.2018 by the learned counsel for the appellant that the services of the respondents would not be terminated and the said *interim* Order has continued.

5. The learned senior counsel appearing for the appellants, drawing our attention to the appointment letters dated 28.07.2014, submits that the Offer of Appointment was on ‘Contract Basis’ which



was duly accepted by the respondents. He further submits that as the respondents accepted their appointment on contractual basis, they could not have been allowed to challenge the same, four years thereafter.

6. Issue Notice

7. Notice is accepted by Ms. Latika Choudhary, the learned counsel on behalf of the respondent No.2.

8. Let notice of these appeals be served on the respective respondent No. 1, through all permissible modes, returnable on 2nd September, 2025.

9. Keeping in view the submission made, we grant *stay* on the enforcement of the Impugned Order. It is, however, directed that the statement given by the counsel for the appellant before the learned Single Judge, as recorded on 10.10.2018, shall continue.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

MARCH 25, 2025/Pr/IK

Click here to check corrigendum, if any