



2025:DHC:6311-DB



\$~3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 9

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

*Date of decision: 30.07.2025*

- + **W.P.(C) 13341/2019 & CM APPL. 54188/2019, CM APPL. 36135/2021, CM APPL. 2835/2025**
- + **W.P.(C) 112/2020**
- + **W.P.(C) 1163/2020**
- + **W.P.(C) 356/2020 & CM APPL. 998/2020**
- + **W.P.(C) 601/2020 & CM APPL. 1960/2021**
- + **W.P.(C) 2209/2022 & CM APPL. 17772/2025**

PANKAJ ROHILLA AND ORS.  
SUDHIR  
SANJAY KUMAR AND ORS  
SAJAN  
PARVEEN AND ORS.  
SUNIL KUMAR

.....Petitioners

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

.....Respondents

**Present for the petitioners:**

Mr.Sudir Nandrajog, Sr. Adv. with  
Mr.Ranbir Singh Kundu, Mr.Ankur  
Chhibber, Mr.Mukesh Kumar,  
Mr.Ashutosh Bhardwaj, Mr.Anurag  
Pandey, Mr.Srikant Singh &  
Mr.Srajan S. Kulshrestha, Advs  
Mr.Sachin Miglani & Ms.Sukriti  
Ghai, Advs  
Mr.Ashutosh Bhardwaj, Adv

**Present for the respondents:**

Mr.Ripudaman Bhardwaj, CGSC with  
Mr.Kushagra Kumar & Mr.Amit  
Kumar, Advs



Ms.Bharati Raju, SPC with  
Ms.Divayangi, Adv  
Mr.Rajendra Sahu, SPC with  
Mr.Sameer Sharma, Adv  
Ms.Aakanksha Kaul, Mr.Aman  
Sahani & Ms.Ashima Chopra, Advs  
Mr.Rajesh Kumar, SPC with Mr.Yash  
Narain & Ms.Pragya Yadav

**CORAM:**

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

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

1. These petitions have been filed challenging the order dated 31.10.2019 passed in O.A. No. 1671/2018, titled ***Pankaj Rohilla & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.***, dismissing the O.A. filed by the petitioners herein by a totally unreasoned and cryptic Order, the relevant portion of which reads as under:

*“6. In view of the facts and circumstances narrated above and In view of the law laid down by various Courts and particularly in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Karnataka Public Service Commission Vs. B.M. Vijaya Shankar (1992) 2 SCC 206, we find that the impugned orders passed by the respondents with respect to each of the applicants cannot be interfered with.”*

2. As the learned Tribunal has given no reasons for its conclusion, which is contained in paragraph 6, apart from stating that they have followed the Judgement of Supreme Court in ***Karnataka Public Service Commission v. B.M. Vijay Shankar***, (1992) 2 SCC 206, the Order cannot be sustained.



3. Accordingly, it is set aside and the matter is remanded back to the learned Tribunal for a fresh consideration. The OA shall be restored back to its original number and shall be considered afresh by the learned Tribunal on its merit.

4. The parties shall appear before the learned Tribunal on 19<sup>th</sup> August, 2025.

5. We are informed that there were a total of 34 applicants before the learned Tribunal, out of whom only 28 have challenged the Impugned Order before us in form of these Writ Petitions. The consideration of the O.A. shall, therefore, be confined by the learned Tribunal only for these 29 writ petitioners; the order having become final for the remaining 5. The above direction is being passed for the reason that the recruitment process in question was of the year 2013-14 and the Impugned Order of the learned Tribunal is dated 31.10.2019; to reopen the matter for those who did not challenge the Order of the learned Tribunal, therefore, would not be advisable.

6. Keeping in view the above, we further request the learned Tribunal to make endeavour to dispose of the O.A. within a period of three months of its first listing before it.

7. The petitions, along with the pending applications, are disposed of.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**MADHU JAIN, J**

**JULY 30, 2025/rv/ik**