



\$~35

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

Date of decision: 08.10.2025

+ W.P.(C) 15347/2025
NAVEEN KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Anuj Aggarwal, Ms.Tanya
Rose, Ms.Anjali Bansal, Advs.

versus

DELHI SUBORDINATE SERVICES SELECTION BOARD &
ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Nemo

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPL. 62839/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 15347/2025 & CM APPL. 62838/2025

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioner, challenging the Order dated 02.04.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No.1090/2025 and M.A. No.1257/2025, titled ***Naveen Kumar v. Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board & Ors.***, whereby the learned Tribunal dismissed the said O.A. filed by the petitioner herein, both, on the grounds of delay as well as on merits.

3. To give a brief background in which the present petition arises, the petitioner had applied for the post of TGT (Natural Science) (Male) under Post Code: 35/21, pursuant to an Advertisement issued



by the respondent no.1 on 12.05.2021. The online Computer-Based Test was conducted by the respondent no.1 on 07.09.2021 and 08.09.2021, and the result was declared on 21.12.2021. The cut-off marks for shortlisting candidates in the Unreserved Category for uploading the e-dossier was fixed at 115.58. The petitioner, having secured 115.72 marks, that is, higher than the stipulated cut-off, uploaded his e-dossier. Thereafter, the final result was declared by the respondent no.1 on 28.07.2022, with the last provisionally selected/nominated candidate in the Unreserved Category having obtained 118.01 marks. The petitioner was placed in the waitlist, the validity of which was to expire on 27.07.2023.

4. The petitioner, thereafter, filed an O.A., being O.A. No. 2689/2023, contending that the waitlist panel had not been operated by the respondents. The said O.A. was disposed of by the learned Tribunal *vide* Order dated 05.09.2023, directing the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation in a time-bound manner.

5. Pursuant thereto, the petitioner submitted a detailed representation, which was rejected by the respondents *vide* communication dated 25.10.2023, stating therein that, till 27.07.2023, candidates up to serial no. 82 (out of 92) in the waitlist panel of the Unreserved Category had been issued offer of appointment, and that no vacancies remained unfilled as on 27.07.2023.

6. The petitioner thereafter filed the present O.A. on 02.03.2025, challenging the aforesaid communication.

7. In the meantime, in compliance with an Order dated 10.09.2024 passed by the learned Tribunal in C.P. No. 717/2023 in



O.A. No. 2465/2022 and Order dated 03.01.2025 in M.A. No. 4041/2024 in C.P. No. 717/2023, the respondent no.1 issued a supplementary result notice bearing no. 962 dated 31.01.2025. The petitioner contended that, in view thereof, the waitlist panel could not be treated as having expired. However, the learned Tribunal rejected the said contention of the petitioner.

8. As would be evident from the above, the validity of the waitlist panel expired on 27.07.2023, and *vide* Communication dated 25.10.2023, the respondent no.1 had informed the petitioner that all vacancies had been filled from the waitlist panel, which was operated up to serial no. 82 out of a total of 92 candidates. The subsequent supplementary result was issued in compliance with the directions of the learned Tribunal in another matter, the benefit of which cannot accrue to the petitioner herein as it cannot have any effect on the validity period of the waitlist panel. While the necessity and purpose of maintaining a waitlist panel cannot be undermined, at the same time, it cannot have an indefinite life; granting such an extension would, in fact, prejudice the rights of candidates seeking to participate in subsequent recruitment process.

9. Accordingly, we find no merit in the present petition. The same is, accordingly, dismissed. The pending application is also disposed of as being infructuous.

10. There shall be no order as to costs.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

OCTOBER 8, 2025/Arya/Yg