



2026:DHC:2807-DB



\$~63

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

+ W.P.(C) 4323/2026 & CM APPL. 21084/2026

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF EDUCATION AND RESEARCH
AND TRAINING AND ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Manish Kumar Saran,
Standing Counsel for NCERT with Mr.
Sidhant Sharma and Mr. Aditya Mani Saran,
Adv.

versus

ATUL BISHT AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. A.K. Trivedi, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

%

02.04.2026

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. This writ petition is directed against order dated 24 July 2025 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal¹ in OA 1980/2024.

2. We have heard Mr. Manish Kumar Saran, learned Standing Counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Trivedi for the respondents.

3. OA 1980/2024, in which the impugned order has come to be rendered, was instituted by the respondents who had participated in the selection process for selection to the post of TV Producer Grade-

¹ "the Tribunal" hereinafter



2026:DHC:2807-DB



II, consequent to an advertisement dated 22 April 2023.

4. Respondent 1 belongs to the Unreserved category and Respondent 2 belongs to Other Backward Classes. The prescribed qualification and experience for recruitment were as under:

“A. Educational Qualification:

- A degree in Mass Communication from a recognized University

OR

- A degree in any discipline with a diploma in Mass Communication from a recognized University or equivalent.

B. Experience:

- Three years' experience in the production of films or TV programs in direction/film or TV production.”

5. The respondents participated in the written examination. Their results were declared. Consequent to declaration of results, they were shortlisted and called for documents verification.

6. As the respondents' name did not figure in the final result which was issued on 22 April 2024, they petitioned the Tribunal by means of OA 1980/2024.

7. Before the Tribunal and also before this Court, the stand of the petitioner was that the respondents did not possess the requisite experience for recruitment to the post to which they had aspired, as they did not have, to their credit, three years regular service in the



2026:DHC:2807-DB



production of films or TV programs in direction/film or TV production.

8. The Tribunal has dealt with this aspect and noted that the advertisement merely required three years' experience and not three years' experience in regular capacity.

9. Mr. Manish Kumar Saran, learned Standing Counsel for the petitioners, reiterates, before us, the said contention and submits that he has no other contention to make by way of challenge to the impugned order.

10. We find no error in the order passed by the Tribunal. The experience prescribed is three years' experience in the production of films or TV programs in direction/film or TV production. The fact that the respondents do possess the said experience is not in dispute.

11. The only contention of the petitioner is that the experience was not after regular appointment. Inasmuch as the required experience is not, as per the advertisement, required to be after regular appointment, we do not find any error in the view taken by the Tribunal.

12. Accordingly, we see no reason to interfere with the impugned order, which is accordingly upheld.

13. Let compliance therewith be ensured within four weeks from today.



2026:DHC:2807-DB



14. The writ petition is dismissed in *limine*.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

APRIL 2, 2026

dsn