



\$~14 & 15

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

Date of decision: 08.12.2025

(14)+ W.P.(C) 6655/2019 & CM APPL. 28095/2019, CM APPL. 38480/2019

PUNAM SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Anmol Pandita and
Mr.Rajesh Chauhan, Advs.

versus

THE SECRETARY, DELHI SECRETARIAT & ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs.Avnish Ahlawat, SC for
GNCTD (Services) with
Mr.Nitesh Kumar Singh,
Ms.Aliza Alam and
Mr.Mohnish Sehrawat, Advs.

(15)+ W.P.(C) 854/2023 & CM APPL. 3307/2023, CM APPL. 3308/2023

MANJIT HOODA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Anuj Aggarwal and
Mr.Nikhil Pawar, Advs.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs.Avnish Ahlawat, SC for
GNCTD (Services) with
Mr.Nitesh Kumar Singh,
Ms.Aliza Alam and
Mr.Mohnish Sehrawat, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

1. These petitions have been filed by the petitioners, challenging



the Order dated 28.02.2018 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the, 'Tribunal') in O.A. 1890/2017, titled ***Jayanti & Ors. v. GNCT of Delhi & Ors.***, filed by the petitioners herein whereby the said O.A. has been dismissed by the learned Tribunal.

2. To give a brief background of the facts in which the present petitions arise, the respondents invited applications for the post of TGT (Domestic Science) *vide* Advertisement No.02/2010 under the Post Code 67/10 for 63 vacancies. The selection process, however, could not be initiated and in the meantime, Advertisement No.02/2012 for the same post under the Post Code 165/12 for another 42 vacancies was issued by the respondents. The common examination for both Advertisements was conducted on 28.12.2014 and two distinct merit lists were prepared; one for the Post Code 67/10 and the other for the Post Code 165/12. On representations received from candidates who were common applicants under both Advertisements, the respondents verified their claims and found 16 candidates to be common candidates under both the Advertisements. Accordingly, a revised result was declared, treating them as selected under the Post Code 67/10, since they met the merit.

3. Aggrieved of the same, the petitioners challenged the revised merit list before the learned Tribunal.

4. The learned Tribunal dismissed the said challenge finding no infirmity in the decision taken by the respondents.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the revised merit list could not have been issued by the respondents. We are



2025:DHC:11090-DB



unable to accept the same submission.

6. Once it is not challenged that separate results were issued for the two selection processes by the respondents, the candidates who were found meeting the merit in the selection process initiated by the Advertisement No.02/2010 under the Post Code 67/10 were to be accommodated for the same. There can be no infirmity attached to the respondents in the said decision.

7. Accordingly, we find no merit in the present petitions. The same along with the pending applications are dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

DECEMBER 8, 2025/sg/dk