



2025:DHC:3121-DB



\$~47

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

Date of decision: 30.04.2025

+ W.P.(C) 4930/2025 & CM APPL. 22658/2025

BED PRAKASH AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Sriparna Chatterjee, Mr.
Ashwin Romy & Mr. Manish,
Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Gauri Goburdhun, Sr.
Panel Counsel with Mr.
Sankalp Mishra, Adv. for
R1&3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner, challenging the Order dated 20.01.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal (PB), New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as 'learned Tribunal') in Original Application (O.A.) No. 01 of 2025 titled '*Vaidehi Saran Vyas & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.*', allowing the said O.A. filed by the respondent Nos. 4 to 13 with the following direction:

" 8. Since the respondents have decided to publish the answer keys, it would be in the interest of justice that they are directed not to



2025:DHC:3121-DB



schedule the training until the candidates' representations against the answer key are finally decided.

9. At this stage, learned counsel for the applicant seeks that the applicants also need a copy of their OMR sheet to compare with the answer key. The respondents are also ready to allow them to see their OMR sheets.

10. Let the applicants be given a chance to see the copy of their OMR sheets on their asking latest by 22.01.2025. The applicants to approach DPO, Admin in this regard. Further respondents shall schedule the training of the selected candidates after the representation of the candidates is decided.”

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the learned Tribunal has erred in not appreciating that there was no legal compulsion on the respondent to publish the answer key before declaring the final panel for the post of Junior Engineer under the 20% L.D.C.E quota.

3. She submits that the learned Tribunal was also misguided into believing that the selected candidates have not yet commenced their training. She submits that the training for the selected candidates commenced prior to the passing of the Impugned Order, on 01.01.2025 when they were directed to undergo field training from 03.01.2025.

4. She submits that the entire process as directed by the learned Tribunal would take considerable time, and in the meantime, the petitioners would continue to suffer. She submits that the equities can always be balanced by stating that the appointment of the petitioners



2025:DHC:3121-DB



would be subject to the outcome of any challenge that is laid to the selection process.

5. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, however, are unable to accept the same.

6. In the present case, admittedly before declaring the final result, the official respondents had not published the answer key, thereby denying an opportunity to the candidates to file any representation/objections there against. The respondents, therefore, conceded before the learned Tribunal that they would not only publish the answer key, but also allow the petitioners who had approached the learned Tribunal, to see their OMR sheets. The learned Tribunal, therefore, stipulated a strict timeline for the petitioners therein to make an application latest by 22.01.2025 for being shown their OMR sheet. We are informed that this process has already taken place; the Answer Key has also been published; and representations there against have been received. We are further informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that these representations are under consideration and would be decided within a period of four weeks from today.

7. The learned Tribunal faced with the above situation and in order to ensure that no further equities or rights are created in favour of any party, has directed the respondents to schedule the training of the selected candidates once the revised result, if required, is published on the representations of the candidates being decided. We do not find any infirmity in this approach of the learned Tribunal.

8. Accordingly, we dismiss the present petition, however, with a



2025:DHC:3121-DB



direction to the official respondents to ensure that the representations that have been received pursuant to the Impugned Order, are decided by the respondents within a period of four weeks and the revised result, if required, is published.

9. We further clarify that if, on the consideration of the representations received, the revised result is published or if a decision is taken not to revise the result, and such result or decision is challenged, the impugned order or this order shall not be cited as a precedent for obtaining an automatic stay of the training of the officers so selected. Any prayer for interim relief in such a challenge, if made, shall be considered by the learned Tribunal remaining uninfluenced by any observation made in the impugned order or the present judgment.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

APRIL 30, 2025 /pr/mn/ik

Click here to check corrigendum, if any