



2025:DHC:1345-DB



\$~57

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

+ W.P.(C) 2236/2025 and CM APPLs. 10449-10450/2025

STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Vineet Dhanda, CGSC with
Mr. Vikrant Goyal, Ms. Shweta Shandilya
and Mr. Saksham Sethi, Advocates

versus

VIKASRespondent

Through: Ms. Esha Mazumdar, Mr. Setu
Niket and Ms. Unni, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

20.02.2025

%

C.HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. The order dated 20 May 2024 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal in OA 1516/2024, under challenge in this writ petition, at the instance of the Staff Selection Commission, reads as under:

“In the instant OA, the applicant has prayed for the following reliefs:-

- “i. Call for records of the case;
- ii. Quash and set aside the order dated 29/01/2024 passed by Review Medical Board.
- iii. Pass an order directing the Respondents to constitute an independent Medical Board and to conduct the medical examination of the applicant;
- iv. Pass an order directing respondents to



appoint the applicant to the post of Constable (Exe.) Male with all consequential benefits including arrears, etc along with interest at GPF rates;

v. Award cost of the proceedings: and

vi. Pass any order/relief/direction (s) as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice in favour of the applicant.”

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the parties submit that the issue raised in this OA stands concluded by the decision of this Tribunal titled as **Ravi Prakash vs. Staff Selection Commission & Ors.**¹ decided on 14.05.2024.

3. For parity of reasons, we allow the present OA in terms of the directions given in the aforesaid OA. However, for the sake of the convenience, the directions given by the Tribunal in ***Ravi Prakash*** (supra) case are reproduced below:-

“4. In the conspectus of things, we find that the facts in the present case and the ones in the aforesaid OA are similar, in all fours. Accordingly, the instant OA is also disposed of on the same analogy. Respondents are hereby directed to comply with the aforesaid directions (***Teekaram Singh Meena vs. SSC and Ors.***)² within twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.”

4. In view of the above, this OA is also disposed of in the light of aforesaid directions. No order as to costs.”

2. Clearly, the order has been passed by consent between learned Counsel for the parties that the case was covered by the earlier decision rendered by the Tribunal in ***Ravi Prakash v Staff Selection Commission.***

3. Neither side can, therefore, claim to be aggrieved by the

¹ Order dated 14 May 2024 in OA No. 1101/2024

² Order dated 10 May 2024, OA No.519/2024



2025:DHC:1345-DB



impugned order.

4. This writ petition is, therefore, misconceived and is, accordingly, dismissed.

C.HARI SHANKAR, J.

AJAY DIGPAUL, J.

FEBRUARY 20, 2025/yg

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)