



\$~78

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010368022026
+ **W.P.(C) 11421/2026 & CM APPL. 52916/2026**
NAVEEN Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anmol Panwar, Advocate.

versus

CENTRAL BOARD OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Manisha Singh and Ms. Ritika,
Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
11.08.2026

%

1. This writ petition seeks the following reliefs:

- a) *Issue a writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to consider the candidature of the Petitioner for Post Codes 03/25 and 04/25 strictly in accordance with merit and applicable recruitment rules;*
- b) *Issue a writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to disclose the basis on which the Result Notification dated 15.05.2026 recorded that no eligible OBC candidates were available and vacancies remained unfilled;*
- c) *Direct the Respondents not to reject or exclude the candidature of the Petitioner merely on the ground that the prescribed ratio of 1:5 candidates for interview is not available;*
- d) *Direct the Respondents to fill notified vacancies from amongst eligible and qualified candidates available in the recruitment process rather than leaving vacancies unfilled on arbitrary grounds;*
- e) *Pass any other order(s) which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.*

2. At the outset, this Court has considered the maintainability of the



present petition. The dispute raised by the Petitioner against the Respondent, i.e., the Central Board of Secondary Education, falls within the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal¹ under Section 14 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. Moreover, in view of the judgment of the Supreme Court in *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India & Ors.*,² the Petitioner, has an efficacious alternative remedy before the Tribunal, and therefore, cannot invoke the writ jurisdiction of this Court.

3. Considering the above, this Court is not inclined to entertain the present petition in view of the availability of an alternate efficacious remedy before CAT.

4. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed with liberty to the Petitioner to take recourse to appropriate remedies in accordance with law before CAT. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

5. It is clarified that this Court has not examined the merits of the case. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

AUGUST 11, 2026

nk

¹ “CAT”

² (1997) 3 SCC 261.