



2025:DHC:3794-DB



\$~124

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

Date of decision: 14.05.2025

+ W.P.(C) 6393/2025
STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION & ANR.Petitioners
Through: Ms.Avshreya Pratap Singh
Rudy, Adv. for Mr.Amit Gupta,
SPC
versus
VEERENDRA SINGHRespondent
Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPL. 29196/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 6393/2025 & CM APPL. 29195/2025

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioner, challenging the Order dated 14.05.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 996/2024, titled *Veerendra Singh v. Staff Selection Commission & Anr.*, allowing the said O.A. filed by the respondent with the following directions:

"In the conspectus of things, we find that the facts in the present case and the ones in the aforesaid OA are similar. Accordingly, the instant OA is also disposed of on the same analogy. Respondents are hereby directed to comply with the aforesaid directions (OA No.519/2024 – Teekaram Singh Meena vs.



2025:DHC:3794-DB



SCC and Ors.) within twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.”

3. As it is evident from the above, the Impugned Order had granted twelve weeks’ time to the petitioners to comply with the directions passed by the learned Tribunal. However, the present petition has been filed by the petitioners on 15.04.2025, that is, with a delay of about eleven months, without any justification thereof.

4. In this regard, we may draw reference to the Judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply & Sewerage Board & Ors. v. T.T. Murali Babu***, (2014) 4 SCC 108, wherein the Supreme Court has held as under:-

“16. Thus, the doctrine of delay and laches should not be lightly brushed aside. A writ court is required to weigh the explanation offered and the acceptability of the same. The court should bear in mind that it is exercising an extraordinary and equitable jurisdiction. As a constitutional court it has a duty to protect the rights of the citizens but simultaneously it is to keep itself alive to the primary principle that when an aggrieved person, without adequate reason, approaches the court at his own leisure or pleasure, the court would be under legal obligation to scrutinise whether the lis at a belated stage should be entertained or not. Be it noted, delay comes in the way of equity. In certain circumstances delay and laches may not be fatal but in most circumstances inordinate delay would only invite disaster for the litigant who knocks at the doors of the court. Delay reflects inactivity and inaction on the part of a litigant — a litigant who has forgotten the basic norms, namely, “procrastination is the greatest thief of time” and second, law does not permit one



to sleep and rise like a phoenix. Delay does bring in hazard and causes injury to the lis.”

5. In the present case, the respondent had approached the learned Tribunal being aggrieved of the rejection of his candidature for appointment to the post of Constable (Exe.)(Male) in the Delhi Police Examination, 2023 on the ground of his perceived unfitness. The learned Tribunal has directed his re-medical examination. In such matters, the petitioners have to act with expedition as delay causes not only irretrievable injustice to the respondent, who would keep waiting in hope that he may be declared fit in such re-examination and may secure employment and therefore, leave out other opportunities of employment that may come his way in the interregnum, but also to the petitioners as well in the form of administrative chaos if the respondent is to be later offered employment. The petitioners, therefore, cannot be allowed to challenge the Impugned Order at its leisure and in the meantime defy the direction of the learned Tribunal with impunity.

6. In view of the unexplained delay, we do not deem it proper to interfere with the Impugned Order in exercise of the extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India vested in us.

7. The petition along with pending application, is accordingly, dismissed on account of delay and laches.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

MAY 14, 2025/rv/SJ

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