

ईमेल द्वारा

DGT-HC024/8/2026-O/o DIR (TC) (E- 79267)

भारत सरकार/Government of India

कौशल विकास एवं उद्यमिता मंत्रालय/ Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship

प्रशिक्षण महानिदेशालय/Directorate General of Training

7वीं मंजिल, कौशल भवन, न्यू मोती बाग,

चाणक्यपुरी, नई दिल्ली – 110023,

दिनांक : 10th August 2026

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Subject: Compliance with the Order dated 15.07.2026 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh, Gwalior Bench, in W.P.C 25702/2026 titled Usha Devi Pvt. ITI Ater Road Porsa District Morena vs. Union of India & Ors. – reg.

Madam/Sir,

I am directed to issue the decision of Grievance Redressal Committee on the above subject matter. The facts and decision of the committee is annexed at ***Annxure-1***.

This issues with the approval of Competent Authority.



(सतीश कुमार)

संयुक्त निर्देशक, टी . सी अनुभाग

To

The Director, Directorate of Skill Development, 4th Floor, Gas Rahat ITI Building, Govindpura Bhopal.

Copy for information to: -

1. Sr.PPS to DG, DGT, Delhi.
2. PPS to DDG (Affiliation).
3. Regional Director, RDSDE Madhya Pradesh , 4th Floor, Gas Relief & Rehabilitation ITI Building, Govindpura, Bhopal - 462023
4. DGT MIS Portal in-charge, DGT HQ, New Delhi, with the request to upload this order on DGT MIS Portal & update the data as recommendation please.
5. Concerned ITI.



(राजेश कुमार)

उपनिदेशक टी . सी अनुभाग

Brief Facts of the case

1. The petitioner institute i.e, Usha Devi Pvt. ITI (PR23000775) has been de-affiliated vide DGT order dated 19.06.2026 (hereinafter "impugned order") in pursuance to the recommendation made by the 29th SCAA dated 08.05.2026.
2. Thereafter, the petitioner challenged the decision of 29th SCAA by way of WPC 25702/2026 seeking following relief(s):

"7. 1 That, order annexure P/1 dated 04.06.2026 passed by the respondent no.2 may kindly be quashed.

7.2 That, respondent authority may kindly be further directed not to de affiliated the petitioner institute till the final out come of grievance which was submitted by the petitioner institution.

7.3 That, other relief doing justice including cost be ordered."

3. That the Hon'ble Court disposed of the matter on 15.07.2026 inter alia directing DGT to decide the grievance raised by the petitioner institute. The operative para is extracted as hereunder-

"4. Considering the limited and innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the present petition with a direction to respondent Nos.1 and 2/competent authority to consider and decide the petitioner's grievance/complaint (Annexure P/6) by passing a reasoned and speaking order, strictly in accordance with law, after affording an opportunity of hearing to all concerned, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of four weeks four weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. 5. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the claims raised by the petitioner, and the competent authority shall consider and decide the grievance/complaint (Annexure P/6) independently and strictly in accordance with law."

4. The petitioner has submitted its representation in compliance to the above order on 21.07.2026 *inter alia* praying that the matter may be re-considered for affiliation similar to OM Pvt ITI and to decide the grievance raised in the portal on 18.06.2026. The brief submission made in grievance is that the petitioner had duly replied to the show-cause notice, denying the allegations of illegal activities on the NCVT Portal and asserting that portal access is controlled by DGT. The institute alleges that its reply was not considered and that a Joint Inspection was ordered without first deciding its representation. It further submits that although the inspection order was initially challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh, the petition was not pursued subsequently. The institute has requested that its grievance and earlier reply be examined and decided on merits before any Joint Inspection is undertaken, and has prayed that no further action be taken until the grievance is disposed of.

TC section observations:

5. Briefly stated, the petitioner's case is that the institute was de-affiliated by DGT on the ground that it had denied inspection on two occasions, namely 17.04.2025 and 04.07.2025. The petitioner was afforded adequate opportunity to make a representation before the 26th Standing Committee on Accreditation and Affiliation (SCAA) meeting held on 15.01.2026, pursuant to a notice issued on 06.03.2026, to which the petitioner submitted a reply on 05.04.2026. Since the reply was not submitted within the stipulated time and the petitioner had denied inspection on the aforesaid two occasions, the impugned de-affiliation order came to be passed by the DGT.
6. That the petitioner has sought parity with OM Pvt. ITI, Morena (PR23001088). However, the two cases are factually distinguishable. In the case of OM Pvt. ITI, the reply to the Show Cause Notice was received on 26.03.2026, i.e., within the stipulated period (06.03.2026 to 26.03.2026), and accordingly the matter was reconsidered. In contrast, the petitioner Usha Pvt. ITI submitted its reply only on 05.04.2026, after the expiry of the prescribed timeline. Therefore, the petitioner cannot claim parity with OM Pvt. ITI, and its request for similar treatment is not tenable.
7. That the reply submitted by the petitioner on 05.04.2026 was duly scrutinized. Upon examination, it was observed that a flex board bearing the name of the petitioner ITI had been displayed at the institute premises. The petitioner has also annexed a few photographs purportedly depicting the workshops and machinery. However, it cannot be overlooked that, when inspections were scheduled on two occasions to verify the institute's infrastructure and compliance with the prescribed Affiliation Norms, the petitioner refused to permit the inspection.
8. That the mere pendency of a case before the Hon'ble Court could not have been a valid ground for denying inspection, particularly in the absence of any interim order or stay restraining the competent authority from conducting the inspection. The petitioner was, therefore, under an obligation to facilitate the inspection in accordance with the Affiliation Norms. Mere submission of photographs cannot establish that the institute complies with the prescribed norms.
9. That the controversy pertaining to joint inspection involved in the present case is covered by this Hon'ble Court in its order dated 01.04.2025 passed in Writ Petition 8116/2025 titled MAA SHITLA PVT. I.T.I. v. UNION OF INDIA & ORS., wherein the Hon'ble Court had been pleased to dismiss the writ petition. The relevant paras from the order are reproduced herewith, for your ready reference -

"...5. Counsel for petitioner could not point out any provision of law which prohibits repeat inspections. If certain complaints are received, then it is the duty of apex body to decide those complaints and in certain cases, same cannot be done without verifying on the spot after carrying out due inspection.

6. It is also not out of place to mention here that by impugned order dated 24.02.2025, inspection of total 16 private ITIs was to be done, therefore, it cannot be said that petitioner is the victim of pick and choose or discrimination.

7. Considering the totality of facts and circumstances of the case and in absence of any bar for repeat inspections which can be done by apex body, coupled with the fact that inspection in compliance of impugned letter dated 24.02.2025 has already been carried out, therefore, no case is made out warranting interference. Petition fails and is hereby

10. That the issue pertaining to the conduct of inspection have further been answered in a Writ Petition CWP-20763-2025 titled: Modern ITI Bathinda v. Directorate General of Training, filed at the Punjab and Haryana High Court at Chandigarh, wherein, it was

stated by the Hon'ble High Court that, a fresh inspection would not prejudice the institute. The relevant para from the order dated 28.09.2025 is reproduced as follows:

"...5. Although, learned counsel for the petitioner opposes the contention of the State, but upon perusal of the materials on record, as also the specific assertions made in the counter affidavit of the State, we do find justifiable reasons to exist on record, on account of which a fresh inspection is required to be conducted in the matter. We otherwise feel that petitioner would not be prejudiced in any manner if the authorities conduct the required inspection once again. For such purposes, we grant liberty to the State to carry out the necessary inspection, afresh, and to conclude the process within a period of four weeks and pass appropriate orders thereafter."

11. That furthermore, the issue pertaining to the the conduct of inspection have also been answered in a writ petition S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 18022/2025 titled: Pooja Pvt. ITI & Ors. v. State of Rajasthan & Ors., filed at the Jodhpur Bench of the Hon'ble High Court of Rajasthan. The relevant para from the order dated 23/09/2025 is reproduced as follows:

"...8. In the opinion of this Court, the conduct of the petitioner-Institutions in refusing to undergo inspection in compliance of the SSDEC decision dated 25.03.2025 raises serious concerns with respect to the functioning of the institutions and clearly indicates that they want to run the institutions without there being any control of the affiliating bodies or the SSDEC. No institution can claim it as a matter of right that inspection should be conducted on a particular date and in a particular manner. This Court finds no violation of the fundamental and legal rights of the petitioner-Institutions in the present case.

9. Consequently, this Court finds no illegality in depriving petitioner- Institutions from admitting the students without first respondents being satisfied that the deficiencies pointed out by the inspection team in their reports have already been removed."

Grievance Committee decision:

12. Upon consideration of the facts of the case and the observations of the TC Section, it is concluded that the petitioner has sought restoration of affiliation primarily on the basis of the case of OM Pvt. ITI, which is distinguishable on facts and does not advance the petitioner's case. The petitioner has **blatantly refused** for the inspection two times and also failed to furnish any plausible explanation now for denying inspection despite being afforded adequate opportunities. Further, the documents and photographs annexed in support of its claim that the institute is functional are insufficient to establish compliance with the prescribed Affiliation Norms. The fact that a flex-printed name board bearing the name of the institute appears to have been recently affixed at the premises raises serious doubts regarding the continuous functioning of the institute in accordance with the prescribed norms.
13. It is imperative that Industrial Training Institutes (ITIs) comply with the norms prescribed by the DGT to ensure the delivery of quality vocational training. The actions taken by the DGT are intended to secure compliance with the Affiliation Norms, maintain the prescribed standards of training, and safeguard the interests of trainees as well as the vocational education system. The welfare of trainees is of paramount importance to the DGT. The petitioner's repeated refusal to permit inspection raises serious concerns regarding the institute's compliance with the prescribed norms.

Further, the petitioner has failed to produce any credible material demonstrating that the institute is functional and possesses the requisite infrastructure and facilities in accordance with the Affiliation Norms.

14. The DGT cannot be expected to schedule repeated inspections where an institute itself obstructs or refuses the inspection process. In these circumstances, the submissions made by the petitioner in its reply dated 05.04.2026, grievance dated 18.06.2026, and representation dated 21.07.2026 are devoid of merit and are **accordingly rejected**. Consequently, the decision of the 29th Standing Committee on Accreditation and Affiliation (SCAA) **does not warrant any interference**.
15. However, the petitioner institute is granted liberty to apply afresh application for affiliation in accordance with the provisions of the Affiliation Norms, 2025.

1/2/20

