



2025:DHC:8576-DB



\$~76

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 12970/2025, CM APPL. 53057/2025 & CM APPL. 53058/2025

INSPECTOR SUDHIR KUMAR AND ORSPetitioners

Through: Mr. M.D. Jangra, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr Ripudaman Bhardwaj
CGSC with Mr Amit Kumar Rana Adv.

Mr. Ajay Pal Law Officer CRPF, Insp.
Athurv CRPF, Mr Ramniwas Yadav CRPF

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

%

22.09.2025

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. By this writ petition, the petitioner seeks quashing of the result of candidates who have qualified Paper III (Essay, Precis Writing and Comprehension) for the post of Assistant Commandant (GD) through the Limited Department Competitive Examination held for recruitment to the Central Armed Police Forces¹ (CRPF², BSF³, SSB⁴

¹ CAPFs

² Central Reserve Police Force

³ Border Security Force

⁴ Sashtra Seema Bal



2025:DHC:8576-DB



and ITBP⁵) for the vacancy year 2024 and 2025.

2. The petitioners additionally pray for reserving the CCTV footage of the examination centers. Other similar prayers have also been made.

3. We have already heard Mr. M. D. Jangra, learned Counsel for the petitioner at considerable length on 26 August 2025.

4. Mr. Jangra had sought to submit that there was widespread cheating and mis-conduct during the course of the examination and that, therefore, the entire examination should be scrapped and a fresh examination be held.

5. At that stage, the respondents had declared the mark wise results only for the CRPF and have not declared the results for the other CAPFs. Mr. Jangra had sought to show us, from the results declared for the CRPF selectees, that candidates who were seated at one centre were getting similar marks.

6. We had perused the results of the CRPF selections and we do not find this to be substantiated.

7. Nonetheless, as Mr. Jangra raised a secondary objection, as to why individual mark lists has not been released for the other CAPFs, we had directed the respondent to release the individual mark list. The

⁵ Indo-Tibetan Border Police



individual mark list for the respective CAPFs has been uploaded on their websites as directed by us.

8. Mr. Jangra again reiterates the contention that he advanced on 26 August 2025. He submits that roll numbers of persons who were stationed at one unit were assigned together as a result of which such persons sat together in one center and secured identical marks. He submits that this reveals that there is rampant copying.

9. Mr. Jangra is not able to show us any proscription in law against persons in one unit being allocated roll numbers together.

10. Needless to say, the manner of allocation of roll numbers is an administrative exercise, which is best left to the authorities. In the absence of any breach of any rule, regulation or guideline in that regard, we cannot sit in appeal over the manner in which the respondents decide to allocate roll numbers.

11. Nonetheless, to satisfy ourselves, we requested Mr. Jangra to point out instances of candidates who sat together and scored identical marks. He has referred to us by way of example to the following candidates in the list of qualified candidates for BSF:

| Roll No. | Force NO. | Name of Candidate | Paper I (Intelligence Test & General Knowledge) (Maximum Marks 100) | Paper II (Professional Skill) (Maximum Marks 100) | Paper III (Essay, Precis Writing and Comprehension) (Maximum Marks 100) | Aggregate (Paper I+Paper II + III) (Maximum Marks 300) |
|----------|-----------|-------------------|---|---|--|--|
| 19290240 | 163101754 | Saurabh Singh | 63 | 90 | 62 | 215 |
| 20300224 | 163101949 | Saurabh Kumar | 63 | 93 | 53 | 209 |
| 20300229 | 183102195 | Vipul Gahlaut | 60 | 93 | 50 | 203 |



12. Mr. Jangra submits that Saurabh Singh and Saurabh Kumar have scored identical marks in Paper I and Saurabh Kumar and Vipul Gahlaut have scored identical marks in Paper II. They sat together.

13. To say the least, this contention can hardly make out a case of unfair means.

14. From a bare glance of the marks scored by the aforesaid three candidates, it is clear that Vipul Gahlaut has scored 60 Marks in Paper I, which is different from the marks scored by Saurabh Singh and Saurabh Kumar which are 63 in each case.

15. Similarly, Saurabh Singh and Saurabh Kumar scored 93 marks each in Paper II whereas Vipul Gahlaut scored 90 marks.

16. Insofar as Paper III is concerned all the three candidates have scored widely differing marks.

17. Clearly, the plea that unfair means have been adopted because candidates have been grouped together at one centre is merely a shot in the dark. There is nothing whatsoever, on the basis of which Mr. Jangra is able to substantiate this submission.

18. This petition appears to be an attempt, by some unsuccessful candidates, to delay the selection process. We deprecate it.



2025:DHC:8576-DB



19. The writ petition is dismissed.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.

SEPTEMBER 22, 2025/AT