



2026:DHC:8368



\$~40

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% *Date of Decision: September 25th, 2026*

CNR No. DLHC010462232026

+ W.P.(C) 14218/2026 & CM APPL. 66552/2026, CM APPL. 66553/2026

SKILL SYSTEM AND WELFARE SOCIETY.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Shahbaaz Jameel, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Dhananjai Rana, CGSC
with Mr. Sumit Ranjan, GP.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN****AMIT MAHAJAN, J. (Oral)**

1. By the present petition, the petitioner challenges the order dated 17.07.2026 and demand notice dated 21.07.2026 passed by the respondent authorities pursuant to which the petitioner's organization was blacklisted and a recovery of ₹41,62,086/- along with 10% penal interest was sought.

2. Briefly stated, the petitioner's organisation was empanelled by the respondent authorities as an empanelled training partner *vide* letter dated 31.03.2023 to impart skill training of persons with disabilities under the *National Action Plan for Skill Development of Persons with Disabilities*. Subsequently, as per the project specific proposal of the petitioner's organisation, an offer letter was issued to the petitioner to provide skill training to 3990 PwDs at 21 centres.

3. Thereafter, a total amount of ₹41,62,086/- was released by the



2026:DHC:8368



respondent authorities to the petitioner towards first instalment of training cost and job outreach activities for 17 batches comprising 510 trainees. It is the case against the petitioner that during the monitoring of ongoing skill training, the respondent authorities observed certain issues in the conduction of training for which a team was sent to carry out a surprise physical inspection of the skill training centres of the petitioner's organisation. Upon the surprise physical inspection the training centres during June 2024, as is the case against the petitioner, certain deficiencies were found in all the centres and clarification was sought. These deficiencies included but were not limited to manipulation of biometric attendance in several training batches, submission of forged documents and the like. Consequently, a point wise clarification was sought *vide* letter dated 09.10.2024 which was provided on 19.11.2024.

4. Upon being dissatisfied with the clarification provided, two show causes dated 14.02.2025 and 15.05.2026 were issued to the petitioner which were duly replied to. Thereafter, upon examination of the reply, it was observed by the respondent authorities that the petitioner was misleading the department and had only supplied forged and fabricated documents. Consequently, the impugned order of blacklisting as well as the impugned demand notice were issued.

5. While there is no counter to the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner urged that the petition itself be heard finally today.

6. In order to bolster its case, the petitioner merely argued that the respondent authorities had only assessed 17 batches and had come to the conclusion that the petitioner was supplying false and forged



documents. He further argued that the respondent authorities did not examine a single aspirant before arriving at the aforesaid conclusion and as such prays that the impugned order of blacklisting and demand notice be quashed.

7. The learned CGSC, on the other hand submits, that the orders were passed after a proper inspection and merits no interference by this Court.

8. Considering that there is no reply to the petition, this Court is saddled with deciding the petition on the basis of the pleadings and the facts as presented today before this Court.

9. Upon a holistic appraisal of the pleadings on record, and the rival contentions of the parties, this Court is not persuaded to quash the impugned order of blacklisting or the demand notice. A *prima facie* look on the material on record indicates that the petitioner had indulged in manipulation of the biometric records and had presented forged documents to substantiate his arguments.

10. Evidently, as per the report, when the physical inspection of the training centres were carried out, the respondent authorities, *inter alia*, found that the actual number of trainees present in many batches were far lower than the number of trainees reflected in the biometric attendance. For instance, it was found that in three batches the number of trainees found during physical inspection was – Nil, 5 and 3 but the biometric attendance indicated presence of 26, 29 and 27 trainees respectively. In support of his case, the only stance taken by the petitioner was that the trainees had left the centre due to heavy rain and were called back after the team visit by the respondent authorities.



2026:DHC:8368



11. Further, in respect of two other batches at Village Anjani centre, the respondent authorities found that no trainee was physically present, however, the biometric attendance indicated that 45 trainees were present. Again, as is borne out from the record, the petitioner had discernibly sought to justify the same by stating that due to heavy rain, students had left early after marking their attendance in the morning, and two digital reports of two newspapers dated 12.06.2024 were provided. It is the case of the respondents that on scrutiny, it was found that these reports were on public domain and were actually published on 13.09.2024 and 12.09.2024 which revealed that the petitioner had submitted forged documents in which the date of the news has deliberately been modified. Certain other allegations of similar nature had also been made.

12. As noted above, the limited ground pressed before this Court to seek quashing of the impugned orders is that only 17 centres were inspected and no aspirant was examined. Upon an examination of the record, these arguments do not aid the case of the petitioner. Merely because only a few centres and not all centres were physically inspected or the fact that no aspirant was examined does not suffice to say that the impugned orders were arbitrarily passed. The record *prima facie* reveals manipulation and fraudulent behaviour on the part of the petitioner.

13. The contentions raised by the parties, the material on record as well as the show cause notices issued to the petitioner reveal that the present case involves various disputed questions of facts. It is well settled that the power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India



2026:DHC:8368



ought not to be exercised where a case involves determination of serious disputed questions of facts.

14. The relief sought by the petitioner in the present case is predicated upon the determination of disputed questions of such nature which cannot satisfactorily be adjudicated merely on the basis of affidavit. Such questions necessitate proper appreciation and evaluation of evidence, a course that falls beyond the ordinary scope of proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

15. Based on a holistic appraisal of the facts and material presented thus, no ground to warrant exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution is made out.

16. The present petition is accordingly dismissed.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 25, 2026

DV