



2026:DHC:4170-DB



\$~14

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

+ W.P.(C) 11389/2024

DR VISHAL CHADHA

.....Petitioner

Through: Dr. Monika Arora, Mr. Subhrodeep Saha, Ms. Anamika Thakur and Mr. Abhinav Verma, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF GOVT OF NCT DELHI THROUGH CHIEF
SECRETARY & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC with Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms. Aliza Alam and Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat, Advocates.

Mr. Devvrat Yadav, SPC with Mr. Kartik Sharma, Advocate for UOI.

Mr. Kaushal Kumar Sharma, Mr. Aman Karan and Mr. Rohan Jain, Advocates for UPSC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

ORDER (ORAL)

%

11.05.2026

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. This writ petition assails judgment dated 9 August 2024 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal¹ in OA 583/2023.

2. In view of the developments which have taken place during the

¹ "Tribunal" hereinafter



currency of these proceedings before this Court, it is not necessary for us to advert in detail to the dispute between the parties. Suffice it to state that the petitioner was aggrieved by the marking given to him by the Union Public Service Commission for his Annual Confidential Reports². The petitioner's case was that he was entitled to be given 4 marks for his ACRs which would have entitled him to induction in the post of Medical Officer (Homeopathy) in the GNCTD.

3. This position was conceded by the GNCTD before this Court as is recorded on 17 December 2025. The order passed by this Court on the said date reads as under:

“1. Today, it is not denied by the learned counsel for the respondents that the UPSC had wrongly marked the petitioner, and on basis of his ACR, he should have been granted four (04) marks, which would have made him entitled to induction to the post of Medical Officer (Homeopathy).

2. The only issue that now remains to be considered by this Court is the date of such induction. While the learned senior counsel for the petitioner claims that it should be from the date of his initial appointment on compassionate ground in the year 1997, the learned counsel for the respondents contends that it should be only from the date of initial constitution of the service, which was in the year 2009.

3. This issue is being considered by us in a batch of petitions, including W.P.(C) 1265/2018, titled *Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Anr v. DE. Yoginder Gupta & Anr.*, which is listed on 13.01.2026 at 2:30 P.M.

4. Accordingly, list this petition on 13th January, 2026 at 2:30 P.M., along with the said batch of petitions.”

4. All that remains, therefore, is for the Court to ascertain the year from which the petitioner would be entitled to be inducted as Medical

² “ACR” hereinafter



2026:DHC:4170-DB



Officer (Homeopathy).

5. The afore-extracted order dated 17 December 2025 notes that the respondent had agreed to the induction of the petitioner as Medical Officer (Homeopathy) from the date of initial constitution of service in 2009. However, by a subsequent order dated 10 February 2026, this Court clarified that the reference to “2009” in the order dated 17 December 2025 was a typographical error and corrected “2009” to “2007”.

6. Mr. N.K. Singh, learned Counsel for the respondents, submits that the respondents are willing to treat the induction of the petitioner as Medical Officer (Homeopathy) in the GNCTD with effect from 2007.

7. Learned Counsel for the petitioner Dr. Monica Arora, on instructions, submits that her client is also agreeable to this course of action.

8. As such, no dispute survives for adjudication by this Court.

9. It is clarified that the petitioner would be entitled to be inducted as Medical Officer (Homeopathy) in the GNCTD with effect from 2007.

10. The petitioner would be entitled to consequential benefits in accordance with law.



2026:DHC:4170-DB



11. The writ petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.

MAY 11, 2026/pa