



\$~53

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

Date of decision: 06.08.2025

+ W.P.(C) 11728/2025 & CM APPL. 48008/2025

MANISHA SEJWAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Aditya Sharma, Mr. F. I.
Choudhary, Mr.Vimal Nigam,
Mr.David Choudhary &
Mr.Anurag Nagar, Advs.

versus

DELHI SUBORDINATE SERVICE SELECTION BOARD &
ANR.Respondents

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

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner, challenging the Order dated 08.04.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No.1945/2017, titled *Manisha Sejwal v. Delhi Subordinate Service Selection Board & Ors.*, whereby the learned Tribunal dismissed the O.A. filed by the petitioner herein.

2. To give a brief background of the facts from which the present petition arises, the respondent no. 1 advertised vacancies for the post of PGT (Political Science) by an Advertisement dated 15.06.2012.



The petitioner had applied for the said post on 27.02.2014.

3. The petitioner cleared the Tier-I Examination for the said post. In the Tier-II Examination, however, the petitioner was declared unsuccessful. The respondent no.1 then published the Answer Key for Tier-II Examination on 16.07.2015. Finding mistakes therein, the petitioner and other submitted representations to the respondent no. 1.

4. On 06.06.2016, the respondent no. 1 published a Revised Answer Key, correcting the answers to as many as 77 questions. The petitioner, still not being satisfied and claiming that certain mistakes persisted in the revised answer key, again represented to the respondent no. 1.

5. The respondent no. 1, however, by a Public Notice dated 23.01.2017, stated that no further changes to the Answer Key were warranted, and declared the result of the selection process, in which the petitioner did not make the cut-off, having secured 96.75 marks against the cut-off of 107.75 marks for the OBC category. In the final select list, the last selected candidate in the OBC category had secured 124.75 marks.

6. The petitioner, therefore, approached the learned Tribunal by filing the above O.A., praying for the following relief:

"(i) The Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to quash and set aside the impugned Result Notices No. 488 dated 17.03.2017 and Supplementary Result Notice No. 494 dated 22.03.2017 [ANNEXURE-A-1(Colly)] whereby respondent No. 3 to 67 have provisionally been selected for the post of PCT (Political Science)Female (Post Code No. 150/12);

(ii) The Hon 'ble Tribunal may graciously be



pleased to pass an order directing the respondent No. 1 and 2 to constitute an expert Committee of as many as five eminent and expert persons from different Universities and to prepare a fresh 'Model Answer Keys' for the question papers given by respondent No. 1 in Tear-II examination held on 30.11.2014 for the post of PCT (Political Science) Female [Post Code 150/12] and thereafter, re-evaluate the answer scripts returned by the candidates in the said examination and to prepare a fresh merit list on the basis of said re-evaluation;"

7. The learned Tribunal, as noted hereinabove, has dismissed the O.A. observing that the respondents had considered the representations made against the Answer Key twice and only thereafter published the result.

8. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Revised Answer Key still contained mistakes which required rectification.

9. We are afraid that we cannot accept the above submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner. The respondents had considered the representations made against the Answer Key and found no infirmity in the Revised Answer Key. Before us as well, the learned counsel for the petitioner has been unable to point out any glaring mistake in the Revised Answer Key.

10. As noted hereinabove, the selection process pertains to the year 2012-2014, with the final result having been declared on 17.03.2017. Given the above factors, we do not deem it proper to further prolong the agony of the selected candidates. We, therefore, refuse to exercise our jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

11. For the above reasons, the petition, along with the pending

