



\$~6

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

%

Date of Decision : 03.02.2026

+ W.P.(C) 3404/2025

BHARATH SINGARAPPA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shivesh Kaushik, Mr. A. Abhiraj
and Mr. Aamir Abbas Naqvi, Advs.

versus

UNION PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr Ravinder Agarwal, Mr. Manish
Kumar Singh, Mr. Vasu Agarwal and
Mr. Lekh Raj Singh, Advs. for R1.
Mr. R. V. Sinha, SPC, Mr. Raj
Kumar, Mr. A. S. Singh, and Ms.
Shriya Sharma, Advs. and Inspector
Athurv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner with the following prayers:-

“A. Issue a Writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction quashing the cancellation of the Petitioner’s candidature of the CAPF Examination 2023, to the extent of denying the Petitioner a seat in the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) despite meeting



the eligibility criteria and clearing all stages of the selection process as outlined in the notification dated 26.04.2023.

B. Issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction directing the Respondents to forthwith offer the Petitioner a seat in the CRPF in accordance with his merit position in the CAPF Examination 2023.”

2. In effect, the petitioner is seeking a direction to the respondents to forthwith offer him a seat in Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) in accordance with the merit position in Central Armed Police Forces (Assistant Commandants) Examination, 2023 [CAPF Examination 2023].

3. The facts to be noted are that the petitioner is challenging the final result of CAPE Examination 2023 conducted by the respondent no.1, i.e. Union Public Service Commission (UPSC). According to the petitioner, despite successfully clearing all stages of examination with an All India rank of 208, he was denied a seat in his choice of service, i.e., CRPF due to a mere technical requirement related to the submission of a Other Backward Classes Non-Creamy Layer (NCL) certificate.

4. Mr Shivesh Kaushik, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that CAPF Examination 2023 notification stipulated that the OBC NCL certificate must be issued within a specific period, i.e., between 01.04.2023 to 16.05.2023; however, the petitioner had a valid OBC NCL certificate dated 16.02.2023 issued by the competent authority at Bengaluru and also another that was issued to him in the month of February 2024. According to him, due to prevailing government policy in Karnataka at that time, he was unable to obtain a fresh NCL certificate within the specified period as the



policy did not allow for the issuance of the multiple NCL certificates within a period of a year. He submits that the petitioner made diligent efforts to address the issue by communicating with the UPSC and CRPF through email and letters explaining the circumstances, and requested them to consider his existing NCL certificate as a valid one. However, his candidature was kept provisional and he was denied the seat in the CRPF. He submits that even though, the petitioner had NCL certificates for the financial year 2022-23 and 2023-24, but the respondents insisted upon the petitioner having an NCL certificate only between the period 01.04.2023 to 16.05.2023. Admittedly, the petitioner does not have such a certificate and despite being in merit, he has been denied the appointment.

5. Mr Ravinder Agarwal, learned counsel appearing for the UPSC though would justify the impugned action of the respondents, he also state that the issue is no more *res integra* as the very advertisement became the subject matter of challenge in ***Raghvendra Singh & Another v. UPSC & Another, 2025:DHC:11105-DB*** wherein this Court in paragraph no.58-59 held as under:-

“58. In the present case, it is not the case of respondents that the petitioners did not possess any OBC-NCL certificates, rather, it is evident from the record that the petitioners were in possession of OBC- NCL certificates for the relevant FY of the CAPF (AC) Examination of 2023 and 2024. The only impediment appears to be that the certificates were not issued within the stipulated timeframe. Hence, in the absence of any material grounds such as non-supply, fabrication, etc., for the cancellation of candidature of the petitioners, this Court cannot deem the OBC-NCL certificates as invalid for the



purposes of recruitment merely on the ground that they were not issued during the stipulated cut-off period, i.e., 01.04.2023 to 16.05.2023 or between 01.04.2024 to 14.05.2024 respectively. Therefore, keeping in mind the decisions of Ravi Kumar (supra) and Ms. Anu Devi (supra) we find that a caste certificate merely reaffirms a pre-existing fact and furnishing the said certificate is only “ministerial” in nature and is also in tandem with the principles of equality and affirmative action envisaged by our Constitution under Articles 14 and 16.

59. We further find that to cancel the candidature of otherwise eligible candidates, on sole grounds of issuance date, deprives the petitioners of their fundamental rights under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India and actually runs contrary to the object sought to be achieved by providing reservations in public employment as per the reasoning laid down in Ram Kumar Gijroya (supra), Anil Kumar (supra) and Pushpa (supra) discussed in the foregoing paragraphs.”

6. Mr Agarwal submits that the UPSC intends to challenge the judgment of this Court in ***Raghvendra Singh & Another (supra)*** before the Supreme Court. However, as there is no stay on the operation of the said judgment, we are of the view that the issue which has been raised by the petitioner is covered by the judgment of this Court in ***Raghvendra Singh & Another (supra)*** and for parity of reasons, we hold and direct the respondents to consider the candidature of the petitioner at the relevant stage of the selection process, subject to verification of the OBC NCL certificate furnished by him whereby the cut off date shall not be a factor for disqualification. The respondents shall be at liberty to test and/or examine other criteria of eligibility and/or qualification required in respect of appointment of the petitioner. The petitioner shall be granted his due



2026:DHC:898-DB



seniority as per the final result, but shall not be paid any financial benefits.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed in the above terms.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

FEBRUARY 03, 2026

M