



2025:DHC:7272-DB



\$~3

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

*Date of decision: 21.08.2025*

+ W.P.(C) 3064/2024 & CM APPL. 12592/2024  
DELHI SUBORDINATE SERVICES SELECTION BOARD  
(DSSSB) AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr.Naushad Ahmed Khan &  
Ms.Archana Chaudhary, Advs

versus

SATYAVIR SINGH AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.M.K. Gaur & Mr.Anoop  
Kumar, Advs

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

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)**

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner, challenging the Order dated 02.05.2023 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the, 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 3887/2016, titled *Satyavir Singh v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Ors.*, disposing of the said O.A., with an innocuous direction as under:-

*"3. We, therefore, order as under:-*

*The respondents are directed to supply to the applicant the status with respect to his result as well as the last candidate*



2025:DHC:7272-DB



*who has been selected in terms of the re-drawn merit list.  
The aforesaid exercise shall be completed within six weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.”*

2. It is the case of the respondents that the respondents had applied for the post of Fire Operator against the 315 vacancies advertised by the petitioners, *vide* advertisement No.003/1999 dated 06.05.1999. It is averred that the petitioners herein had issued the result of only 149 candidates out of 315 vacancies, along with a list of 35 candidates, whose results were shown to be kept in abeyance. The respondents submitted that no reason was assigned for not selecting them in the impugned selection process. The respondents, approached the learned Tribunal *vide* the above O.A., which came to be disposed of in terms of the above quoted directions.

3. The petitioners have challenged the said Impugned Order by the present petition, *inter alia*, contending that the respondents had not approached the learned Tribunal well in time. This Court, by an order dated 03.05.2024, allowed the petitioners to file additional documents to show that the respondents had not approached the learned Tribunal well in time. We had also made it clear that it will be open to the respondents to pursue their pending Contempt Petition.

4. Though, more than a year has since passed, the additional documents have still not been filed by the petitioners. We, therefore, are being left with no option but to dismiss the present petition on the ground of non-prosecution.

5. Our order, however, is not on merits of the present petition and,



2025:DHC:7272-DB



therefore, will not influence the learned Tribunal in the adjudication of the Contempt Petition, if any, pending before it.

6. The petition, along with the pending application, is dismissed.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**MADHU JAIN, J**

**AUGUST 21, 2025/rv/Vs**