



2025:DHC:8204



\$~78

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

%

Decided on: 15.09.2025

+ W.P.(C) 14085/2025 & CM APPL. 57729/2025

RAM BHAJAN YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jitender Anand, Advocate.

versus

DELHI TRANSCO LTD. & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC with Ms. Aliza Alam, Advocates with Ms. Neha Gupta, Mr. G.S. Rawat, Mr. S.P. Singh, Mr. Brham Prakash.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

PRATEEK JALAN, J. (ORAL)

1. Issue notice. Ms. Avnish Ahlawat, learned Standing Counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondents.
2. By way of this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, the petitioner challenges a communication of the respondent No. 1 – Delhi Transco Ltd. [“DTL”] dated 20.02.2025, by which it cancelled a provisional offer of appointment made to the petitioner.
3. The petitioner was a candidate for the post of Junior Engineer (Civil) in terms of a vacancy notice dated 29.12.2021 advertised by the Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board [“DSSSB”]. The advertisement covered 575 vacancies in various organisations, including 19 vacancies in DTL. The petitioner filed his application in the OBC category.



4. According to the petitioner, he participated in a written test, and was issued a provisional letter of appointment dated 29.08.2024, pursuant to which he was required to submit his documents for verification. The petitioner sought extension of his joining period, which was granted till 30.12.2024.

5. In October 2024, however, he wrote to DSSSB for permission to upload a further document relating to his application contending that he had inadvertently not submitted the document earlier. DSSSB responded on 30.10.2024 stating that the petitioner having been provisionally selected, his documents had been forwarded to DTL. He thereafter made a representation to DTL on 05.11.2024 and 20.12.2024, but his documents were not considered.

6. By the impugned communication dated 20.02.2025, the petitioner was informed about cancellation of his provisional offer of appointment.

7. I have heard Mr. Jitender Anand, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Ms. Ahlawat, learned counsel for the respondents.

8. The qualifications required for the post were as follows:

“Degree in Civil Engineering from a recognized University or equivalent.

OR

(i) Diploma in Civil Engineering from a recognized Institution or equivalent.

AND

(ii) Two years professional experience as Civil Engineer counted from the date of completion of the qualifying Diploma Examination.”

9. The petitioner holds a diploma in Civil Engineering. The controversy in the present case relates to whether the documents submitted by the petitioner were sufficient to establish that he also had



two years' professional experience as a Civil Engineer, counted from the date of completion of the qualifying diploma examination.

10. The narration of facts in the writ petition is that the petitioner had experience of working as a Junior Engineer with an entity, being Modern Construction Company (Delhi) ["MCC"]. The petitioner relied upon an undated certificate from MCC stating that he worked in the organisation from December 2015 to January 2019. The contents of the said certificate are reproduced below:

*"We are pleased to certify that **Mr. Ram Bhajan Yadav** was working at our organization for three years starting from **December 2015 to January 2019**. He was hired as Junior engineer. He was very committed to his job and very good in coordination across the engineering departments.*

We do congratulate him for his achievements during the job tenure at our organization and wish him success in the future endeavour."

11. At a later stage, the petitioner sought to submit another work experience certificate from a different entity, being AEN Associates Pvt. Ltd. ["AEN"], where he worked from 01.05.2019 to 31.03.2023. However, this document was not considered by DTL, to demonstrate the petitioner's compliance with the work experience eligibility condition.

12. Ms. Ahlawat has produced the "*E-dossier*" forwarded to DTL by DSSSB, which contains the petitioner's application form and supporting documents. The contents of the said dossier are not disputed, and a copy of the documents are taken on record, with the consent of learned counsel for the parties.

13. In the application form submitted by the petitioner, which is part of the documents handed over by Ms. Ahlawat today, he has cited MCC as his employer, and stated that he worked from 01.12.2015 till 01.01.2019



with them. The documents annexed to the writ petition, however, include a communication issued by MCC dated 09.06.2025, which reads as follows:

“With reference to the above subject, we would like to inform you that our earlier confirmation of the employment verification for Mr. Ram Bhajan Yadav was provided due to an oversight.

To clarify, Mr. Ram Bhajan Yadav was not directly employed by us, but he was associated with MGS Construction (Employment Copy Enclosed), a contractor who worked on one of our previous projects.

His services were rendered during the execution of that project under the said contractor.

In light of this, we kindly request you to consider the employment verification in a positive manner and proceed with the verification process accordingly.

Should you require any further clarification, please feel free to contact us.”

[Emphasis supplied.]

This document was issued in response to DTL’s request for verification of the experience certificate submitted by the petitioner.

14. Ms. Ahlawat has handed over a copy of a communication dated 08.01.2025, which was earlier received by DTL from MCC, also in response to the request for verification. MCC stated therein that it did not find any record of the petitioner and that the certificate had not been issued by it. Mr. Anand submits that this communication was not sent to the petitioner.

15. I do not propose to proceed on the basis of the disputed communication handed up by Ms. Ahlawat at this stage, as the letter dated 09.06.2025 relied upon by the petitioner also does not, in my view, support his case. The said letter clarifies that the petitioner was not



2025:DHC:8204



directly employed by MCC, but was “associated” with MGS Construction [“MGS”], which was a contractor who worked on one of MCC’s previous projects. Taking the petitioner’s case at its highest, I am unable to find fault with DTL’s actions, as this communication also does not suffice to verify the petitioner’s experience details in terms of his application. The aforesaid communication was addressed by MCC, in response to an undated letter from MGS, stating that MGS was one of the sub-contractors, who had worked with MCC on a project, and that the petitioner was employed by MGS from December 2015 to January 2019, and was actively engaged in the said project. It contains no details of the project or the capacity in which the petitioner was engaged therein. Most importantly, it negates the petitioner’s claim in his application, that he was ever an employee of MCC.

16. The petitioner has also sought to rely upon an experience certificate issued by AEN dated 31.03.2023, which states that he worked as a Junior Engineer (Civil) in AEN from 01.05.2019 to 31.03.2023. This certificate cannot be of much assistance to the petitioner in the facts of this case, as the petitioner did not claim, in his application form, experience of working with AEN at all. This information was entirely omitted from his application form; this is thus not a case of inadvertence in failing to upload an experience certificate, but a case where the application was not made on the strength of this experience at all. It therefore cannot be used to substantiate the application in any way. Further, the experience certificate is dated 31.03.2023, whereas the cut-off date for ascertainment of educational and experience qualifications in the advertisement in question was 09.02.2022. In view of the fact that experience in AEN was



2025:DHC:8204



not claimed by the petitioner at all, it is not necessary to examine whether a belated certificate could otherwise have been used.

17. In view of the above discussion, I do not find any reason to exercise the writ jurisdiction of this Court, to interfere with the impugned order of DTL. The writ petition is therefore dismissed. The pending application stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

SEPTEMBER 15, 2025

“Bhupi”/AD/