



2026:DHC:6146



\$~1

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% Date of Decision: 29th July, 2026

+ CONT.CAS(C) 309/2026

AMIT KUMAR AND ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. S.K. Rungta, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Prashant Singh, Adv. (Through VC)

versus

VIPIN KUMAR CHAIRMAN, AIRPORT AUTHORITY OF INDIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Digvijay Rai, SC for AAI
alongwith Mr. Archit Mishra,
Advocate, Mr. Deepak Tomar, DGM
(Law) AAI and Ms. Tanya Rohilla,
Manager (Law)
Mob: 9873103599**CORAM:****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA****MINI PUSHKARNA, J. (ORAL):**

1. The present petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the judgment dated 16th October, 2025, passed by the Division Bench of this Court, in *W.P.(C) 61/2025*, titled as *Amit Kumar and Ors. Versus Airport Authority of India*.
2. The directions as contained in the judgment dated 16th October, 2025, are as follows:

“xxx xxx xxx

19. Resultantly, we dispose of these writ petitions in the following
terms:

- (i) The challenge to Note 8 in the DEPWD Notification dated 4 January 2021 is rejected.



(ii) The rejection of the petitioners' candidature for the posts to which they aspire, consequent on Advertisement 03/2023, is quashed and set aside.

(iii) The functional suitability of the petitioners for the posts would be re-assessed. The reassessment would not be undertaken by medical means. It would strictly abide by the decision of the Supreme Court in *In re. Recruitment of Visually Impaired in Judicial Services* and in this judgment. We emphasize that the aim and attempt must be at ensuring that the petitioners are recruited, and not at excluding them from appointment. It is only if, even after scrupulous adherence to the principles and procedure outlined in *In re. Recruitment of Visually Impaired in Judicial Services* and hereinabove, that any petitioner is found entirely unsuitable for appointment as JE, that she, or he, can be disqualified from appointment.

(iv) For this purpose, the re-assessment of the petitioners would take place within two weeks of pronouncement of this judgment. Petitioners who are found suitable would be offered appointment within four weeks thereof. They shall be entitled to be treated as appointed to the concerned posts with other candidates who have been so appointed pursuant to Advertisement 03/2023, along with continuity of service and all other benefits, except back wages.

xxx xxx xxx”

3. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that



though an offer of appointment has been issued in favour of the petitioners day before yesterday, i.e., on 27th July, 2026, however, the said offer of appointment does not contain the requisite information as regards the deemed date of appointment.

4. He further submits that said offer of appointment also does not indicate anything about the fixation of pay of the petitioners, from the deemed date of appointment, as well the fixation of seniority.

5. In response, learned counsel appearing for the respondent submits that all the exercise pertaining to fixation of deemed date of appointment, fixation of pay from the deemed date of appointment, as well as the fixation of seniority, shall be done within a period of eight (08) weeks, after the petitioner joins the service.

6. The aforesaid statement is taken note of.

7. Accordingly, it is directed that the seniority, pay fixation, as well as the deemed date of appointment, shall be fixed by the respondents, within a period of eight (08) weeks, from the date of joining of the petitioner or completion of training, if any.

8. Noting the aforesaid, the present petition is accordingly disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

JULY 29, 2026/SK