



2025:DHC:718-DB



\$~58

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

*Date of Decision: 06.02.2025*

+ W.P.(C) 789/2025, CM APPL. 7224/2025

MANOJ KUMAR SURELA AND ORS. ....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Disha Gupta, Ms. Gayatri  
Virmani and Mr. Soorya  
Gayathry, Advs.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms.  
Laavanya Kaushik, Ms. Aliza  
Alam, Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat,  
Advs.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINDER KAUR**

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J (ORAL)**

1. This petition has been filed challenging the Order dated 07.12.2023 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal ("Tribunal"), Principal Bench, New Delhi in Original Application ("O.A.") No. 3230/2023 titled *Mr. Manoj Kumar Surela & Ors. Vs. Directorate of Education & Ors.*

2. By the Impugned Order, the learned Tribunal has dismissed the O.A. filed by the petitioners herein, while observing that the question of normalisation of the examinations conducted for male and female candidates would not arise as the only difference is of the gender of



the two categories while all educational qualification and requirements are the same and for the same post.

3. The petitioners are in fact aggrieved of a common seniority list being published by the respondents, merging the male and female candidates for the post of Educational and Vocational Guidance Counsellors (“EVGC”). The examinations for the same were conducted on 12.08.2018 and 19.08.2018 for males and females respectively, and the results thereof, were declared on 07.03.2019 and 13.03.2019, respectively. At that stage, the petitioners never raised any grievance of normalisation. It was raised only when, pursuant to the Order passed by the learned Tribunal, the respondents publishing a common seniority list of Males and Females for the post of post of EVGC. Even thereafter, though the Impugned Order was passed by the learned Tribunal on 07.12.2023, the present petition was filed before this Court on 20.01.2025, that is, more than a year thereafter. There is no justifiable explanation for this delay as well.

4. In ***Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply & Sewerage Board and Others v. T.T. Murali Babu***, (2014) 4 SCC 108, the Supreme Court has considered the effect of delay and laches, as under:-

*“16. Thus, the doctrine of delay and laches should not be lightly brushed aside. A writ court is required to weigh the explanation offered and the acceptability of the same. The court should bear in mind that it is exercising an extraordinary and equitable jurisdiction. As a constitutional court it has a duty to protect the rights of the citizens but simultaneously it is to keep itself alive to the primary principle that when an aggrieved person, without adequate reason, approaches the court at his*



2025:DHC:718-DB



*own leisure or pleasure, the court would be under legal obligation to scrutinise whether the lis at a belated stage should be entertained or not. Be it noted, delay comes in the way of equity. In certain circumstances delay and laches may not be fatal but in most circumstances inordinate delay would only invite disaster for the litigant who knocks at the doors of the court. Delay reflects inactivity and inaction on the part of a litigant — a litigant who has forgotten the basic norms, namely, “procrastination is the greatest thief of time” and second, law does not permit one to sleep and rise like a phoenix. Delay does bring in hazard and causes injury to the lis.”*

5. In view of the above, we refuse to entertain the present petition on grounds of it suffering from delay and laches.

6. The petition, along with the pending application, is, accordingly, dismissed.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**SHALINDER KAUR, J**

**FEBRUARY 6, 2025**  
SU/SK/IK

*Click here to check corrigendum, if any*