



2026:UHC:4904

HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Service Single No.477 of 2025

16 June, 2026

Pankaj Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand & others

--Respondents

With

Writ Petition Service Single No. 479 of 2025

Prema

--Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand & others

--Respondents

Presence:-

Dr. Kartikey Hari Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioners.

Mr. K.N. Joshi, learned Deputy Advocate General for the State.

Ms. Priyanka Agrawal, learned counsel for the respondent-
Selecting Body.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

An advertisement was issued by the respondent-Selecting Body on 14.03.2024 inviting applications for appointment to the post of Assistant Teacher, L.T. Grade (Drawing). Petitioner-Pankaj Singh belongs to the OBC category and petitioner-Prema belongs to the S.C. category. Both of them participated in the selection process claiming reservation as Dependents of Freedom Fighters. After selection, names of the petitioners were found in the select list at Serial Nos. 231 and 295, respectively. However, suddenly, names of the petitioners were not recommended by the respondent-Selecting Body for appointment along with other selected candidates whose names were recommended for appointment, as is reflected from the final



recommendation dated 09.02.2025. Feeling aggrieved, petitioners have approached this Court by filing the aforesaid writ petitions.

2. Counter affidavits have been filed by the respondent-Selecting Body. In paragraph 6 of the counter affidavit, it has been stated that the selection was conducted on the basis of the requisition dated 14.12.2024, in which the post for Dependants of Freedom Fighters (DFF) was earmarked for unreserved category candidates. Since petitioners belonged OBC and SC categories therefore, names of the petitioners were not recommended.

3. Rejoinder affidavits have been filed wherein it has been clarified by the petitioners that the selection was made not on the basis of the requisition dated 14.12.2024, rather it was made on the basis of the requisitions dated 24.02.2024 and 27.02.2024, which are annexed as Annexure-1 to the rejoinder affidavit. As per these requisitions, posts for Dependants of Freedom Fighters (DFF) were available to candidates belonging to all categories. There was not category-wise application of DFF reservation.

4. The said fact was clarified by learned counsel for the respondent-Selecting Body. On instructions, it has been stated by learned counsel for the respondent-Selecting Body that the requisitions relied upon by the petitioners in the rejoinder affidavit are correct and the requisition annexed with the counter affidavit is incorrect insofar as this selection process is concerned.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. This Court is of



2026:UHC:4904

the view that when there was no category-wise application of reservation for DFF, respondent-Selecting Body has committed a mistake by not recommending names of the petitioners for appointment to the post of Assistant Teacher, L.T. Grade (Drawing).

6. Accordingly, both the writ petitions are disposed of. Respondent-Selecting Body is directed to take appropriate action strictly in accordance with law in view of the requisitions dated 24.02.2024 and 27.02.2024, and if petitioners are eligible in every respect on the basis of merit, and if there is no legal impediments, their names shall be recommended for appointment to the State Government within a period of four weeks from today.

7. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)

16.06.2026

AK