



2025:DHC:10925-DB



\$~13

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

Date of decision: 01.12.2025

+ W.P.(C) 16257/2023 & CM APPL. 65394/2023, CM APPL. 27412/2025

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.Petitioners
Through: Mr.Gaurav Dhingra and
Mr.Shashank Singh, Adv.

versus

SUSHMA RANIRespondent
Through: Mr.Sourabh Ahuja, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 09.08.2023 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as, the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 1118/2021, titled *Sushma Rani v. GNCT of Delhi & Ors.*, whereby the said O.A. filed by the respondent herein was allowed with the following directions:

"7. It is noted that vide an order dated 17.06.2021, as an interim measure, last appointment to the post of TGT Punjabi (Female) (Post Code 143/2017) under the SC category was made subject to the final outcome of this O.A. The result of the recruitment process in question was declared in the year 2019 and the last selected



2025:DHC:10925-DB



candidate has been working for the last four years. Therefore, the respondents are directed to comply with the directions of this Tribunal without disturbing the last selected candidate and by creating a supernumerary post, if required, to accommodate the applicant if a situation so arises.”

2. The brief facts giving rise to the present petition are that the petitioners issued Advertisement No. 04/17 dated 20.12.2017 for filling up 126 vacant posts of TGT (Punjabi)-Female, (Post Code 143/17) in the Directorate of Education, Government of NCT of Delhi, through a computer-based online examination. *Vide* Notice dated 25.01.2019, the petitioners shortlisted 56 candidates, including the respondent, in the Scheduled Caste Category. As per the said notice, the shortlisted candidates were also required to upload their requisite documents in the e-dossier module between 29.01.2019 and 07.02.2019, for which they were to be separately informed by the respondent via SMS and e-mail.
3. By a subsequent Notice dated 04.02.2019, the petitioners admitted that the process for uploading the documents in the e-dossier module could not be opened due to technical reasons and, therefore, they extended the time for uploading the e-dossiers and documents till 13.02.2019.
4. The petitioners, thereafter, claiming that the respondent had failed to upload her documents in the e-dossier within the prescribed time, cancelled her candidature *vide* Notice dated 30.04.2019.
5. Aggrieved thereby, the respondent submitted representations,



including one dated 01.05.2019, wherein she stated that she resides in a very backward colony where there is no cybercafe except only a small shop at home. She further submits that her husband went to the cybercafe on 04.02.2019 to upload the scanned copies of her certificates, and the shopkeeper operating the site informed him that the same had been done. She also asserted that she did not receive any intimation from the petitioners about the non-uploading of the documents. She submitted that it may be due to a technical fault or other reasons that the documents could not be uploaded.

6. Not receiving any reply to these representations, the respondent filed the above O.A.

7. The learned Tribunal allowed the said O.A., observing as under:

“5. It is seen that the applicant participated and succeeded in the various stages of the selection process. However, her candidature has been rejected on the ground that she failed to upload the e-dossiers during the scheduled period. Admittedly, there was a technical glitch in the website of the respondents due to which the closing date was extended by the respondents themselves. The applicant had attempted to upload the e-dossiers on the website on 04.02.2019 itself. It is important to note that the applicant preferred various representations of her grievances before the respondents. The applicant uploaded the dossiers well within time unlike the applicants before the Hon'ble High Court in W.P.(C) No. 4085/2019. The applicant was vigilant and did the needful well within time as supported by the documents on record.”

8. The learned counsel for the petitioners, placing reliance on an e-

