



\$~12

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

%

Date of Decision: 11.06.2025

+

W.P.(C) 8419/2025 & CM APPL. 36638/2025 (direction)

JOGI ANIL KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Deeksha Prakash, Advocate.

versus

INDIAN COAST GUARD & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sahaj Garg, SPC with Mr. Rudra Paliwal, GP with Mr. Rattan Negi, Indian Coast Guard for UOI.

**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA
JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA**

J U D G M E N T (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has sought following reliefs as extracted from prayer clause:

- a) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction setting aside/holding the action and reasoning of the Respondents, as communicated vide the Impugned Result dated 03.06.2025 declared on the Petitioner's login portal whereby the candidature of the Petitioner was rejected as being illegal, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14, 16, and 21 of the Constitution of India, 1950;*
- b) Consequentially, issue an appropriate writ, order, or direction directing the Respondents to induct the Petitioner from Stage – II of the ongoing recruitment process for the 02/2025 batch;*



- c) Allow the present Writ Petition with exemplary compensation, costs and litigation expenses in favor of the Petitioner and/or*
d) Pass any such other or further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

2. Broadly speaking, candidature of the petitioner was rejected by the computerised system in the process of recruitment as he failed to select stage II centre by 28.05.2025 at 2300 hours, which was taken as his unwillingness for stage II. Apart from that failure to upload the desired stage II centre, on merits, case of the petitioner is yet to be tested in the process of recruitment. In such circumstances, the question before us is as to whether on account of failure to upload the desired stage II centre, the petitioner be deprived of an opportunity to participate in the recruitment process.

3. Learned counsel for respondents accompanied with Mr. Rattan Negi (*through videoconferencing*) accepts notice and fairly admits that the petitioner may be granted another opportunity to rectify the error, as not everyone is well-conversant with the computerised systems. However, the only anxiety expressed on behalf of the respondent is that it may be not treated as a precedent.

4. Accordingly, with consent of both sides, the petition is allowed, granting opportunity to the petitioner to participate in stage II of the recruitment process and for the necessary uploading/selecting venue, handholding assistance shall be provided by the respondents. As requested,



2025:DHC:4965-DB



it is made clear that this order is passed with consent of both sides and shall not be treated as a judicial precedent.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
JUDGE**

**TEJAS KARIA
JUDGE**

JUNE 11, 2025/ab