



2025:DHC:2396-DB



\$~121

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
*Date of decision: 07.04.2025*

+ W.P.(C) 4036/2019

REENU

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jitender Kumar, Advocate.

versus

DELHI SUBORDINATE SERVICES SELECTION BOARD  
(DSSSB) & ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, Standing  
Counsel with Mr. Nitesh Kumar  
Singh, Ms. Laavanya Kaushik,  
Ms. Aliza Alam and Mr.  
Mohnish Sehrawat, Advocates.

**CORAM:**

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

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR**

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (Oral)**

1. This petition has been filed challenging the Order dated 01.03.2019 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as, 'Tribunal') in Original Application ('OA') No. 714/2019 titled ***Renu v. Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board & Anr.***, dismissing the said OA filed by the petitioner herein.

2. The petitioner had applied for the post of Special Education Teacher in the Directorate of Education, pursuant to the Advertisement No.04/2017 issued by the respondents on 20.12.2017.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that she belongs to the Scheduled





2025:DHC:2396-DB



Supreme Court *vide* Order dated 06.03.2020 passed in SLP No. 5067/2020, and in *Soni v. Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board*, 2025 SCC OnLine Del 1474, submits that the plea of the petitioner that due to some technical glitch she could not apply under the SC Category and was forced to apply under the Unreserved Category, cannot be accepted. She submits that the petitioner never protested or made a representation regarding such technical glitch and, in fact, participated in the selection process as an Unreserved Category candidate. It is only post the declaration of the result that the petitioner has raised this plea. She further submits that leftover vacancies had been advertised in the later selection process and merely because some seats still remain vacant, the petitioner cannot claim a right to appointment against these vacancies.

9. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties.

10. The plea of the petitioner that due to some technical glitch she could not apply under the SC Category and had to perforce apply under the General Category, cannot be accepted. The petitioner never raised a grievance regarding the same before the respondents and, in fact, also participated in the selection process. It is only post the declaration of the result, that the petitioner, for the first time, raised this grievance.

11. In similar circumstances, this Court in *Soni* (supra), placing reliance on the earlier judgment in *Amardeep* (supra), rejected a similar plea raised by the petitioner therein, by observing as under:

*“16. We are in agreement with the Tribunal*





