



2025:DHC:10748-DB



\$~4

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

*Date of decision: 29.11.2025*

+ W.P.(C) 1375/2024  
SAHIL DAGAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.M. K. Bhardwaj,  
Ms.Priyanka Bhardwaj and  
Mr.Parveen Kaushik, Advs.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR. ....Respondents

Through: Mrs.Avnish Ahlawat, SC for  
GNCTD (Services) with  
Mr.Nitesh Kumar Singh and  
Ms.Aliza Alam, 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 10.10.2023 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the, 'Tribunal') in O.A. 2615/2021, titled *Sahil Dagar v. Secretary-cum-Commissioner, Development Department, Govt. of NCT of Delhi*, dismissing the O.A. filed by the petitioner herein and finding him not eligible for being appointed to the post of Veterinary Livestock Inspector (VLI).

2. The said post was advertised by the Delhi Subordinate Service



Selection Board (DSSSB) *vide* Advertisement No. 01/2020 issued on 01.01.2020. The Advertisement gave the following essential educational qualification and experience required for the said post:

<i>Educational Qualification:-</i>	<i>Essential:-</i>	1. 10+2 pass in any stream i.e. Science, Commerce, Arts from recognized University/Board. 2. Two years Diploma in Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Science from a recognized University or Board.
	<i>Desirable:-</i>	Nil
<i>Experience:-</i>	<i>Essential:-</i>	One year experience in the relevant field.
	<i>Desirable:-</i>	Nil

3. The petitioner had applied for the said post, however, was declared ineligible for the same *vide* Notice No. 28 dated 07.10.2021 stating as under:

<i>S. No.</i>	<i>TIER-I ROLL NO.</i>	<i>REMARKS</i>
2.	111200200144	Not having one year experience in relevant field after passing the Diploma

4. Aggrieved of the same, the petitioner had filed the above O.A., contending therein that the one year experience that was required as per the advertisement could have been possessed by the applicant even before obtaining the diploma in the Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Science. In support of this plea, the learned counsel for the petitioner had also placed reliance on the Judgments of the Supreme Court in *Anil Kumar Gupta v. Municipal Corporation of Delhi*, (2000) 1 SCC 128, and in *Subhash v. State of Maharashtra & Anr.*, (1995) Supp (3) SCC 332. The same submission is reiterated by the learned counsel for the petitioner before us.



5. He submits that the one year experience required in the Advertisement is not, in any manner, dependent on or relatable to the Diploma in Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Science required in the Advertisement or in the Recruitment Rules. These two are independent conditions and, therefore, the experience gained even before obtaining the Diploma has to be counted for the purposes of meeting the requirement under the Advertisement and the Recruitment Rules.

6. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondents, placing reliance on Section 30 of the Indian Veterinary Council Act, 1984 (hereinafter referred to as the, 'Act'), submits that the question of any person having any experience in even minor veterinary services, before obtaining a diploma or certificate, does not arise as it is only a diploma holder who can practise the same, that too, under the supervision and direction of a registered veterinary practitioner. He submits that, therefore, the candidature of the petitioner had rightly been rejected by the DSSSB.

7. He further submits that, even otherwise, there are issues with the experience certificates submitted by the petitioner, however, the stage for examining the same has not arisen. He has drawn our attention to the contents of the counter affidavit in this regard.

8. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties.

9. As the candidature of the petitioner has been rejected only for the reason that his experience prior to acquiring the diploma would not be counted for the purposes of the recruitment, we shall be confining



ourselves only to this issue. Whether the experience certificate furnished by the petitioner at all can be relied upon by the respondents, would be relevant only if we first find, in favour of the petitioner, the issue which has been raised before us.

10. To answer the said issue, Section 30 of the Act is relevant and is re-produced hereinbelow:

***“30. Right of persons who are enrolled on the Indian veterinary practitioners register.-***

*No person, other than a registered veterinary practitioner, shall--*

*(a) hold office as veterinary physician or surgeon or any other like office (by whatever name called) in Government or in any institution maintained by a local or other authority;*

*(b) practise veterinary medicine in any State:*

*Provided that the State Government may, by order, permit a person holding a diploma or certificate of veterinary supervisor, stockman or stock assistant (by whatever name called) issued by the Directorate of Animal Husbandry (by whatever name called) of any State or any veterinary institution in India, to render, under the supervision and direction of a registered veterinary practitioner, minor veterinary services.*

*Explanation.—“Minor veterinary services” means the rendering of preliminary veterinary aid, like, vaccination, castration, and dressing of wounds, and such other types of preliminary aid or the treatment of such ailments as the State Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, specify in this behalf;*

*(c) be entitled to sign or authenticate a veterinary health certificate or any other certificate required by any law to be signed or authenticated by a duly qualified veterinary practitioner;*

*(d) be entitled to give evidence at any*



*inquest or in any court of law as an expert under section 45 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, (1 of 1872.) on any matter relating to veterinary medicine.”*

*(emphasis supplied)*

11. A reading of the above Section would clearly show that it is only the registered veterinary practitioner who can practise veterinary medicine in any State. The explanation attached to Section 30 of the Act, defines the term “minor veterinary services” to mean the rendering of preliminary veterinary aid, like, vaccination, castration, and dressing of wounds, and such other types of preliminary aid or the treatment of such ailments, etc. The exception carved out in the *proviso* is in favour of a person holding a diploma or certificate of veterinary supervisor, stockman or stock assistant who may practise “minor veterinary services” under the supervision and direction of a registered veterinary practitioner.

12. In the Advertisement, the experience required was in the relevant field which is of Veterinary and Livestock Inspector.

13. From a bare reading of Section 30 of the Act, it can be concluded that it is only a diploma holder who can practise veterinary services and that too, only minor veterinary services. The question of the petitioner obtaining experience prior to his diploma, therefore, does not arise and in fact, would be contrary to the mandate of the Act. The same can be given no cognizance.

14. The reliance placed by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the Judgments of Supreme Court in *Anil Kumar Gupta* (supra) and *Subhash* (supra) is misplaced as in those Judgments, the Supreme

