

**Central Consumer Protection Authority**

**Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi --110001**

Case No: CCPA-2/40/2024-CCPA

In the matter of: Misleading advertisement and unfair trade practice by Dikshant IAS.

CORAM:

Mrs. Nidhi Khare, Chief Commissioner

Mr. Anupam Mishra, Commissioner

APPEARANCES

For Dikshant IAS:

1. Dr. S.S Pandey, Director, Dikshant IAS
2. Mr. Saket Anand, Director, Dikshant IAS

Date: 30.10.2025

**ORDER**

1. The Central Consumer Protection Authority (hereinafter referred to as 'CCPA') received a representation dated 11.01.2024 via speed post from Sardar Vallbhbhai Patel National Police Academy, Hyderabad which includes complaint of Ms. Mini Shukla (Rank-96 UPSC CSE-2021) wherein she alleged the following:-

- *"This is regarding the misleading advertisement that I reported earlier. Some institute names Dikshant published my photograph on their hoarding, even as I have not heard their name. I did appear for a mock interview at Chahal Academy, which is supposedly tied up with Dikshant"*

2. Taking cognizance of the issue, the CCPA in exercise of power conferred under Section 19 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') conducted a preliminary inquiry to examine authenticity of the claims in the impugned advertisement made by the opposite party.

3. The CCPA prima facie observed that Dikshant IAS (hereinafter referred to as 'opposite party') had published advertisements prominently featuring the pictures and names of successful candidates of the UPSC CSE 2021, while concealing important information such as the specific courses opted for by those candidates, and made the following claims:

*i. "200+ result in UPSC CSE 2021" (Annexure-1)*

4. As per the preliminary inquiry report, it was found that the opposite party prominently displayed the names and pictures of successful candidates while concealing important information such as the specific courses opted for by those candidates. Simultaneously, it advertised various types of courses offered by it on its official website, namely: "Offline and Online Courses, including GS Foundation Course (Prelims + Mains), NCERT GS Foundation Course (Prelims + Mains), Essay Skill Enhancement Programme, All India Test Series, and Answer Writing Skill Enhancement Programme." However, it is pertinent to mention that neither any description substantiating the above-mentioned claims was provided in the advertisement, nor was any information or document available to support the claims made by the opposite party.

5. As per the Guidelines for Prevention of Misleading Advertisements and Endorsements for Misleading Advertisements, 2022, Clause 4 mandates that any claim made in an advertisement must be truthful and should not mislead consumers with unsubstantiated claims. Additionally, Clause 12 places a duty on service providers and advertisers to ensure that claims related to objectively verifiable facts are capable of substantiation and to produce such evidence if required by the CCPA, without exaggerating the accuracy, performance, or service of the product.

6. Accordingly, the CCPA issued a notice dated 24.06.2024 to the opposite party for violation of the provisions of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, highlighting the issue of misleading advertisements by concealing important information, i.e., the specific courses opted for by the successful candidates, and based on the allegation made by Ms. Mini Shukla (Rank 96, UPSC CSE 2021). The opposite party was granted

an opportunity to furnish a response within 15 days from the date of issuance of the notice and was directed to submit the following documents to substantiate its claims:

- i. Details of 200+ successful candidates of UPSC Civil Services Examination 2021 as claimed by Dikshant IAS in its advertisement.
- ii. Type of course attended by each such student.
- iii. Enrolment form of each such student.
- iv. Consent form of each such student.
- v. Duration of the course attended by each such student.
- vi. Date of joining of each such student.
- vii. Fee paid along with copies of the receipts.

7. In response to the notice, a reply dated 14.08.2024 was received wherein the opposite party made the following submissions:-

- i. The opposite party organized a Mock Interview Guidance Program for UPSC CSE aspirants at its locations in Mukherjee Nagar, Delhi, and Jaypee Siddharth Hotel, Rajendra Nagar, Delhi wherein it conducted Mock interview & classes on interview guidance. Opposite party also stated that it has proof of all the students whose results were published by them.
- ii. The opposite party acknowledged that there were discrepancies between the advertised claims and the actual offerings of their product/service.
- iii. Opposite party accepted that there was an oversight in the review process of the advertisement before it was published. This oversight led to unintentional discrepancies between advertised claims and the actual offerings of our product/service.
- iv. Assured that they have rectified the advertisement.
- v. Opposite party consistently mentions the courses opted for by students in their advertisements and attached a few examples of advertisements they have published.
- vi. Opposite party apologized for any misunderstanding caused by their advertisement.

8. In view of the above, the CCPA examined the opposite party's reply dated 14.08.2024 and found that the opposite party had failed to submit the requisite

documents sought through the notice, such as the type of course attended by each student, enrolment forms, consent forms, and details of fees paid along with copies of the receipts. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, as well as the reply submitted by the opposite party, the CCPA was satisfied that a prima facie case of misleading advertisement and unfair trade practice under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 existed. Accordingly, vide letter dated 20.08.2024, the CCPA requested the Director General (Investigation) to conduct a detailed investigation into the matter.

9. The Director General (Investigation) in its investigation report dated 25.08.2025 submitted the following:

- i. The advertisement published on the official website of Dikshant IAS Solutions Pvt. Ltd. claimed “200+ Results in UPSC CSE 2021” and identified Ms. Mini Shukla (Rank 96) as its student. However, Ms. Shukla has categorically denied any association with the institute, stating that she has not appeared for a mock interview at Dikshant IAS. The institute failed to provide any documentary evidence substantiating its claim. The omission of material details regarding the nature of services availed by featured candidates constitutes a misleading advertisement under Section 2(28) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019. Moreover, using name and picture of a successful student who has never availed services of the said Institute constitutes unfair trade practice and gross violation of provisions of consumer protection act, 2019 including consumer rights.
- ii. Despite being directed to submit specific records including enrolment forms, consent documents, course details, and fee receipts for the claimed 200+ successful candidates, the institute failed to provide the requisite information. This non-submission undermines the credibility of the claims made in the advertisement and reflects non-compliance with statutory obligations.
- iii. The institute failed to participate in the investigation process, notwithstanding reminders dated 25th July 2025 and 5th August 2025. Further, the Investigating Authority made multiple attempts to contact the institute via official telephonic communications on 19th, 21st, and 22nd August 2025, which went

unanswered. The institute's conduct amounts to deliberate non-cooperation and obstruction of the statutory inquiry.

- iv. Although the institute submitted a written response dated 14th August 2024 acknowledging certain lapses and outlining corrective steps, no verifiable documentation was provided to demonstrate actual implementation. The measures described were generic and insufficient to address the gravity of the misleading claims.
- v. The use of the name and picture of a successful student who has never availed the services of the institute amounts to gross misrepresentation. Such conduct not only qualifies as a misleading advertisement under Section 2(28) but also constitutes an unfair trade practice under Section 2(47) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019. Furthermore, this practice amounts to a gross violation of consumer rights under Section 2(9), including the right to be informed and the right to be protected against unfair trade practices.
- vi. The conduct of the institute not only undermines consumer trust but also violates the statutory framework governing fair trade practices and truthful representation.
- vii. The cumulative effect of these violations reflect a deliberate pattern of misrepresentation and non-compliance, warranting regulatory action under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019.
- viii. A case of violation of abovementioned provisions under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 stands established.

10. The Investigation Report submitted by DG (Investigation) was shared with the opposite party vide letter dated 29.08.2025 to furnish its comments.

11. In response to the investigation report, the CCPA received a reply from the opposite party on 09.09.2025, wherein, following submissions were made:-

- i. Opposite party had already replied on 14th August 2024 with detailed clarifications, after which no further communication was received, leading them to believe the matter was resolved.

- ii. In September 2024, sealing drives by MCD (as per Delhi High Court directions) severely disrupted their operations in Mukherjee Nagar, and recovery is still ongoing.
  - iii. In June 2025, Mr. Saket's (Director of Dikshant IAS) wife was diagnosed with cancer, requiring him to shift to Kolkata for treatment, which caused delays in responding to communications.
  - iv. Regarding Ms. Mini Shukla (AIR 96), she only enrolled for a Mock Interview Session. Evidence of her enrolment form and video link of the session are enclosed ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W3ohfS11\\_d0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W3ohfS11_d0))
  - v. Opposite party assures full cooperation, requests sympathetic consideration of their circumstances, and confirms availability for the hearing.
12. Thereafter, an opportunity of hearing was provided to the opposite party on 17.09.2025 wherein opposite party was represented by Dr. S.S Pandey and Mr. Saket Anand, Directors, Dikshant IAS. They submitted the following:-
- i. Mock Interview Session was organized at Jaypee Siddharth Hotel, Rajendra Nagar, Delhi, and they have proof of all the students whose results were published by them.
  - ii. Regarding Ms. Mini Shukla (AIR 96, UPSC CSE 2021), she had enrolled for a Mock Interview Session. Evidence of her enrolment form and the video link of the session have been submitted to CCPA.
  - iii. All the students mentioned in the impugned claim "200+ result in UPSC CSE 2021" participated in the opposite party's Interview Guidance Programme (IGP).
  - iv. In September 2024, sealing drives by MCD (as per Delhi High Court directions) severely disrupted their operations in Mukherjee Nagar. As of now, Hindi medium coaching class is not operational. English medium classes are still operational.
  - v. Later in June 2025, Mr. Saket's (Director of Dikshant IAS) wife was diagnosed with cancer, requiring him to shift to Kolkata for treatment, which caused delays in responding to communications.

- vi. An agreement was entered into with Chahal Academy, under which both institutes agreed to jointly organize the mock interview sessions for students and share the costs of the arrangements. A common interview panel was constituted for all the students.
- vii. Students had filled out the enrolment forms for the Interview Guidance Programme of both coaching institutes. No fee was charged from the students for the session.
- viii. That they possess documents including payment receipts for the venue booking, amounts paid to panelists, and other requisite documents, and expressed willingness to submit the same if required.
- ix. Both institutes claimed the same successful candidates, despite conducting only one joint interview session.
- x. It is accepted that there was an error in publishing the advertisement at certain places. However, after receiving CCPA's notice, the error was corrected and it was clarified that the said selections in UPSC CSE 2021 were from the IGP.
- xi. Coaching institutes generally conduct mock interview programmes with the objective of showcasing results in their advertisements.
- xii. After realizing this, the institute has stopped advertising UPSC CSE results from 2022 onwards.

13. In view of the above submissions made by the opposite party, the CCPA, vide letter dated 07.10.2025, directed them to furnish the following details:

- i. Enrolment/consent form of all successful candidates against its impugned claim of "200+ result in UPSC CSE 2021".
- ii. A copy of the agreement executed between Dikshant IAS and Chahal Academy regarding the conduct of the joint Interview Guidance Programme.
- iii. Proof of sharing of costs, such as payments made for the venue, honorarium paid to panelists, and other relevant expenses.
- iv. A copy of the banner or any material displayed at the venue declaring the joint venture of both institutes.

- v. Evidence, if any, to demonstrate that the students participating in the IGP were made aware of the joint nature of the interview session for example, hoardings outside the venue, notices, or any declarations communicated to the students.
14. In response to the abovementioned CCPA letter, the opposite party submitted a reply dated 13.10.2025, wherein the following submissions were made:
- i. At present, I have been able to locate 116 enrolment forms, which are attached herewith.
  - ii. I am in the process of locating the remaining forms. A few students enrolment forms were misplaced. Unfortunately, in October 2024, our premises in Mukherjee Nagar were sealed pursuant to a High Court-directed MCD Delhi action, during which several documents were misplaced.
  - iii. With regard to the agreement between Dikshant IAS and Chahal Academy, it was executed on plain paper with mutually agreed terms and conditions. However, due to the sealing incident last year, I have been unable to locate the physical copy of this document, and, unfortunately, I do not possess any digital copy either.
  - iv. I am actively trying to trace all the above documents and request a little more time to do so.
  - v. I am attaching screenshots of honorarium payments made to the panelists associated with the said session, along with a copy of the booking payment made to Hotel Jaypee Siddhartha for the event.
  - vi. Additionally, copies of the posters used during the session are also enclosed.
15. The CCPA examined the documents submitted by the opposite party along with their reply dated 13.10.2025. It was observed that, against their claim of achieving “200+ results in UPSC CSE 2021”, the opposite party furnished only 116 enrolment forms. They failed to provide the remaining enrolment forms or any additional documentary evidence to substantiate the said claim.
16. Further, the opposite party submitted screenshots showing payments made to five panelists associated with the interview session, along with a few photographs of



the panelists. However, it was noted that the booking payments for the hotel and the auditorium where the interview session was conducted were made in the name of Chahal Academy, rather than Dikshant IAS. Moreover, the opposite party did not furnish the following documents as sought by the Authority:

- i. A copy of the agreement executed between Dikshant IAS and Chahal Academy regarding the conduct of the joint Interview Guidance Programme.
- ii. Proof of cost-sharing, such as payments made for the venue or other relevant expenses.
- iii. A copy of the banner or any promotional material displayed at the venue indicating the joint venture of both institutes.
- iv. Any evidence demonstrating that the students participating in the Interview Guidance Programme were informed about its joint nature- such as hoardings, notices, or declarations made available at the venue.

17. In view of the above, it is evident that the opposite party has failed to substantiate its claim of “200+ results in UPSC CSE 2021” with adequate documentary proof and has not produced the requisite evidence demonstrating the existence of a genuine joint venture between Dikshant IAS and Chahal Academy.

18. It may be mentioned that Section- 2(28) of the Act defines “misleading advertisement” in relation to any product or service means an advertisement, which—

- i. falsely describes such product or service; or
- ii. gives a false guarantee to, or is likely to mislead the consumers as to the nature, substance, quantity or quality of such product or service; or
- iii. conveys an express or implied representation which, if made by the manufacturer or seller or service provider thereof, would constitute an unfair trade practice; or
- iv. deliberately conceals important information.

19. From a plain reading of the above provisions of the Act, it is evident that any advertisement must adhere to the following principles:-

- i. It should present a truthful and honest representation of facts.

- ii. Any assertions or guarantees made in the advertisement must be supported by credible and authentic evidence, studies, or materials.
- iii. Must not engage in unfair trade practices as defined under Section 2(47) of the Act. Specifically:
- iv. Important information must be disclosed in a clear, prominent, and hard to miss manner to ensure that no critical details are concealed from consumers.

20. With respect to the advertisement wherein the opposite party claimed “200+ results in UPSC CSE 2021”, the CCPA provided multiple opportunities to substantiate the said claim - through a show cause notice dated 24.06.2024, during the investigation stage, via the investigation report shared through letter dated 29.08.2025 seeking comments, during the hearing held on 17.09.2025, and through CCPA's letter dated 07.10.2025. However, the opposite party failed to furnish the requisite documents to substantiate the claim, such as enrolment forms, consent forms, or fee receipts of all the concerned students.

21. It is important to note that during the hearing on 17.09.2025, the opposite party submitted that all 200 plus students were enrolled in Interview Guidance Programme (IGP).

22. It is worth noting that UPSC Civil Service Examination (CSE) contains 3 phase i.e., Prelims, Mains and Interview. It is only after qualifying the two rigorous stages of Preliminary and Mains stage that candidates get a chance to appear for interview. While the Preliminary test is a screening test but the marks obtained in both the Mains Exams and the Interview are considered in the final selection merit list. The total marks for Main Exams and PT are 1750 and 275 respectively. According to various news reports, approximately 11 lakhs aspirants applied for UPSC Civil Service Examination 2021 and out of these aspirants who qualified Prelims, only 9,214 students appeared for Mains examination and 1,824 sailed to the final round of the Personality Test and finally 685 were declared successful.

23. In the instant case, opposite party has been found to be taking full credit of “200+ results in UPSC CSE 2021” for all the stages of the examination by deliberately

concealing important information from potential aspirants about the specific course taken by the successful candidates. Whereas, all claimed students were enrolled in IGP which implies that all these candidates did not take any assistance from the opposite party for the Prelims and Mains stages of the exam. While Interview is an important stage for selection but the competition at the stage of Prelims and Mains is tougher than at the Interview stage considering large number of candidates competing in those stages. It is safe to say that it is in the vested interest of the opposite party to conceal the important information regarding course opted by successful candidates in order to attract potential consumers/aspirants. Further, it is clear that if the opposite party had truthfully disclosed that the 200+ candidates who had succeeded in UPSC CSE 2021 had taken IGP course from them, then the potential consumers would have had clarity in choosing from the courses offered by the opposite party. Therefore, the concealment of the information is deliberate to create a misleading impression on prospective consumers into making an uninformed choice about the quality of its service.

24. The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 upholds the right of consumers to make informed decisions. Misrepresentation of facts in advertisements interferes with this right, as students might invest their time, money, and effort based on an exaggerated & false success rate. By presenting an untrue, incomplete and misleading claim, the opposite party has engaged in unfair trade practices, warranting corrective measures.

25. Therefore, the impugned claim i.e. “200+ results in UPSC CSE 2021” is misleading and by projecting abovementioned claim and publishing the photographs of successful candidates without their proper authorization or consent, the opposite party not only misled prospective students but also engaged in an unfair trade practice as defined under Section 2(47) of the Act. Such conduct has the effect of inducing students to enroll in the opposite party’s programmes on the basis of false, inflated and unverified claims.

26. Ms. Mini Shukla (Rank-96 UPSC CSE-2021) alleged the following:  
“This is regarding the misleading advertisement that I reported earlier. An institute named Dikshant published my photograph on

their hoardings, even though I have never heard of them. I had only appeared for a mock interview at Chahal Academy, which is supposedly tied up with Dikshant.”

The opposite party, however, submitted that Ms. Mini Shukla had enrolled for a mock interview session, and provided her enrolment form along with a video link of the session as evidence.

27. To verify the submissions of the opposite party, CCPA via mail dated 18.09.2025 sought comments from Ms. Mini Shukla, IPS (Madhya Pradesh). In her response via mail dated 14.10.2025, she made the following submission:

- i. “Yes, I filled the form and the signature on the enrollment form is mine.”
- ii. “At the time I wasn't aware of the partnership between Dikshant and Chahal, I got to know about it much later.”

28. The CCPA also examined the above information submitted by opposite party and found out that Chahal Academy has uploaded the exact same video on its YouTube channel (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v0SzNsPSeVE->) featuring Ms. Mini Shukla.

29. It is important to note that the opposite party failed to disclose to the students that the mock interview session was being organized as a joint exercise between Dikshant IAS and Chahal Academy. Such non-disclosure constitutes concealment of material information, as students might be under the impression that they were appearing under one institute's programme. This deliberate omission falls within the ambit of “misleading advertisement” under Section 2(28) (iv) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019.

30. Additionally, the publication of candidates' photographs, including that of Ms. Mini Shukla (IPS), without clear disclosure of the joint arrangement and without explicit consent establishes misrepresentation. This practice creates a false impression regarding the institute's role in the success of such candidates and constitutes an unfair trade practice under Section 2(47) of the Act.

31. The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 confers upon consumers the right to be informed, which includes the right to receive truthful and accurate information enabling them to make rational choices. Misleading advertisements undermine this right and adversely affect consumer interest, particularly in the field of education where aspirants invest significant time, effort, and financial resources. The facts of the present case establish that the opposite party violated Sections 2(28) and 2(47) of the Act by issuing misleading advertisements and concealing material information about course opted by successful candidates and the joint nature of the mock interview session.

32. This concealment of important details has affected the ability of potential students (consumers) to make an informed choice about which courses to enroll and at what stage of their preparation of Civil Service Examination. The effect of which is violation of Consumer rights u/s 2(9) of the Act. For the potential consumers, true & honest information about specific courses taken by successful candidates would have contributed in their making an informed choice about the course to be opted for ensuring their success at CSE. These facts are important for the potential students to decide on the courses that may be suitable for them and should not have been concealed in the impugned advertisement.

33. The CCPA after carefully considering the written submissions, the submissions made by the opposite party during the hearings and the investigation report submitted by Director General (Investigation) finds that:-

- i. The advertisement is false & misleading as it deliberately conceals important information with respect to the course opted by the said successful candidates from the opposite party's Institute.
- ii. The opposite party has violated the provisions related to misleading advertisement of the Consumer Protection Act 2019:-
  - a. Section 2(28) (i) -Falsely describes such product or service
  - b. Section 2(28)(iv) – Deliberately conceals important information
  - c. Section 2(28)(iii) - Unfair Trade Practice [conveys a representation through *deceptive practice, unfair method* ]
  - d. Section 2(47)- Unfair Trade Practice [*deceptive practice, unfair method* ]

Therefore, CCPA is satisfied that opposite party has engaged in unfair trade practice, false or misleading advertisement as envisaged under the Act and therefore CCPA is of the opinion that it is necessary to impose a penalty in consumer interest.

34. The CCPA is empowered under Section- 21 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 to issue directions to the advertiser of false or misleading advertisement to discontinue or modify the advertisement and if necessary, it may, by order, impose a penalty which may extend to ten lakh rupees and for every subsequent contravention may extend to fifty lakh rupees. Further, Section 21 (7) of the above Act prescribes that following may be regarded while determining the penalty against false or misleading advertisement:-

- a) the population and the area impacted or affected by such offence;
- b) the frequency and duration of such offence;
- c) the vulnerability of the class of persons likely to be adversely affected by such offence.

35. In the present case, it is observed that the opposite party provides both online and offline coaching services across India. While it has a single physical centre in Delhi, its reach through online coaching is extensive and nationwide. Each year, approximately 11,00,000 aspirants apply for the UPSC Civil Services Examination, thereby highlighting the vast target audience potentially influenced by such advertisements.

36. The CCPA also examined the videos uploaded by both Dikshant IAS and Chahal Academy on their respective official YouTube channels related to the successful candidates of UPSC CSE 2021 and observed that the successful candidates claimed by both institutes are identical. In most cases, the same videos have been used by both institutes, claiming full credit for the same UPSC CSE 2021 candidates merely on the basis of conducting a few hours of mock interview session.

37. CCPA further observed that no faculty member or director of the opposite party (Dikshant) was present on the IGP panel. In contrast, Mr. Sumesh Chahal, Founder of Chahal Academy, was seen on the interview panel during the said sessions. This

indicates that all candidates appearing in the IGP were under the impression that the programme was conducted by Chahal Academy alone. The opposite party has failed to produce any credible evidence to establish otherwise.

38. In view of the above, it is pertinent to note that the opposite party (Dikshant IAS) has been found to be in violation on two counts. Firstly, the successful students were not aware during the interview coaching, that the interview programme was a joint exercise between Dikshant IAS and Chahal Academy.

39. Opposite party failed to furnish any documentary evidence such as- agreement executed between Dikshant IAS and Chahal Academy for joint IGP, proof of cost-sharing, and any evidence demonstrating that the students participating in the IGP were informed prior about the joint nature to IGP with Chahal Academy. By suppressing this information Dikshant IAS has sought to piggy ride on the reputation of the other institute (Chahal Academy). This itself constitutes an unfair trade practice defined under the Act. The complainant Ms. Mini Shukla, IPS had clarified that she was not aware about the tie up and she was under the impression that the Interview Guidance Programme was of Chahal Academy.

40. Secondly, the opposite party submitted only 116 enrolment forms against its claim of "200+ results in UPSC CSE 2021", which indicates that the opposite party falsely represented the number of selections in the impugned advertisement. On being queried, the opposite party reasoned that the remaining forms could not be located. The submission of the opposite party is untenable since sufficient time was granted to submit the remaining enrolment forms. Further, the opposite party advertised the names of students without disclosing the courses enrolled, thereby concealing the most critical information from potential consumers of coaching services. The deliberate nature of the concealment is evident from the fact that even the successful candidates were unaware of the joint venture, and the subsequent use of their names as successful candidates from the opposite party only aggravates the offence and casts a serious doubt on the opposite party's intentions. The opposite party not only misled the successful candidates whose names it used in the advertisement but also the prospective consumers who were likely to be influenced by its untruthful claims. The

incidences of misleading the aspirants are on two separate counts. One the aspirants appearing for mock interview and the prospective aspirants through subsequent advertisements. This entire sequence of events reveals the modus operandi of Dikshant IAS in misleading consumers through deceptive advertisements and in misrepresenting facts to the successful candidates of UPSC CSE 2021 who attended their mock interview session. Therefore, the CCPA is of the opinion that it is necessary to impose proportionate penalty on the opposite party in consumer interest.

41. In view of the above, under Section- 20, 21 read with Section 10 of the Consumer Protection Act 2019, CCPA hereby issues the following directions:-

- a) In light of the nature of the violations detailed in the foregoing paragraphs including unauthorized used the name of a successful candidate, it is necessary(as discussed in above paras) that the opposite party is directed to Pay a penalty of ₹ 8,00,000 for publishing misleading advertisement.
- b) Submit a compliance report of the directions (a) above within 15 days of receipt of the Order.

  
.....  
Nidhi Khare  
Chief Commissioner

  
.....  
Anupam Mishra  
Commissioner























← ↻ 🔍 <https://dikshantias.com/selections-upsc-2021> A ☆ 📄 📌 📁 📧 ...

# Dikshant IAS Selections

Home Selections

Whatsapp 98103-86285 For Details

**UPSC - CSE  
RESULT - 2021****We are HONOURED to have you  
all as our students**

 <b>SHRUTI SHARMA</b> AIR-01	 <b>GAMINI SINGLA</b> AIR-03	 <b>AISHWARYA VERMA</b> AIR-04	 <b>YAKSH CHAUDHARY</b> AIR-06	 <b>PREETAM KUMAR</b> AIR-09	 <b>SUNIL KR. DHANWANTA</b> AIR-22		
 <b>SAHITYA PUSAPATI</b> AIR-24	 <b>AVINASH</b> AIR-31	 <b>JASPINDER SINGH</b> AIR-33	 <b>KARTIKAYA JAISWAL</b> AIR-35	 <b>SHUBHAM SHUKLA</b> AIR-43	 <b>ANJALI SHROTRIYA</b> AIR-44	 <b>ABHIJEET RAY</b> AIR-50	 <b>ARPIT SANGAL</b> AIR-53
 <b>ARPIT GUPTA</b> AIR-54	 <b>ALFRED O V</b> AIR-57	 <b>SHRADDHA GOME</b> AIR-60	 <b>TIRUMANI S POOJA</b> AIR-62	 <b>SHREYA SHREE</b> AIR-71	 <b>NAMRATA CHOUBEY</b> AIR-73	 <b>DEEPESH KUMARI</b> AIR-93	 <b>MINI SHUKLA</b> AIR-96

704, Ground Floor, Main Road, Front of Batra Cinema, Mukherjee Nagar, Delhi - 09 📞 **7428092240** **200 +  
Results**

📞 📧

Windows Taskbar: Type here to search, 41°C Haze, 05:33 PM, 18-06-2024



SHRUTI  
SHARMA

Rank 1



GAMINI  
SINGLA

Rank 3



AISHWARYA  
VERMA

Rank 4



YAKSH  
CHAUDHARY

Rank 6



PREETAM  
KUMAR

Rank 9



SUNIL  
KUMAR  
DHANWANTA

Rank 22



SAHITYA  
PUSAPATI

Rank 24



AVINASH

Rank 31



JASPINDER  
SINGH

Rank 33



KARTIKEYA  
JAISWAL

Rank 35



SHUBHAM  
SHUKLA

Rank 43



ANJALI  
SHROTRIYA

Rank 44



ABHIJEET  
RAY

Rank 50



ARPIT  
SANGAL

Rank 53



ARPIT  
GUPTA

Rank 54



ALFRED OV

Rank 57





SHRADDHA  
GOME

Rank 60



TIRUMANI S  
POOJA

Rank 62



SHREYA  
SHREE

Rank 71



NAMRATA  
CHOUBEY

Rank 73



DEEPESH  
KUMARI

Rank 93



MINI  
SHUKLA

Rank 96