



\$~20

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

CNR No. DLHC010392492026

+ **W.P.(C) 12207/2026 CM APPL. 56528/2026**

PAWAN ARORA

.....Petitioner

Through: petitioner in person

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy,
CGSC, Mr. Nasreen khatoon, GP,
Ms. Usha Jamnal, Ms. Nyasa Sharma,
Mr. Siddhant Nagar and Mr. Abhinav
Mall, Advs. for UOI
Ms. Harshita Choubey, Mr. Sameer
Saini and Mr. Udhav Mittal, Advs. for
R-2 and 3

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

21.08.2026

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

“(A) Issue an appropriate Writ, Order or direction, especially a Writ in the nature of Certiorari, declaring clause 8(c) of the Airports Authority of India (Recruitment and Promotion) Amendment Regulations, 2026 dated 11.02.2026 (Annexure P-3), whereby the Explanation under the paragraph 2 of Annexure-I of The Airports Authority of India (Recruitment and Promotion) Regulation, 2020 (Annexure P-2) barring the Independent Legal Professional having 3 years of Independent experience under Note (VI) i.e., Explanation regarding work experience for the post of Manager (Law) – Code 06, invited vide Advertisement having No.



12/2026/CHQ/DR-CHT dated 22.07.2026 (Annexure P-1), being manifestly illegal, arbitrary, discriminatory, beyond jurisdiction and competence of regulation-making power under section 42 of The Airports Authority of India Act, 1994, and ultra vires of Articles 14, 19(1)(g) and 21 of the Constitution of India lacking intelligible differentia with the object sought to be achieved, suffers from legal malice and the principles of natural justice and thus unconstitutional;

(B) Issue a further writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the Respondents to receive and consider the Petitioner's application/form for the post of Manager (Law), Code 6, without rejecting it solely on the ground that his legal experience was acquired through Independent Practice before Indian courts rather than in one of the listed Organizations or in a Law firm satisfying the prescribed turnover threshold of 10 Cr., and permit the Petitioner to submit his application and provisionally participate in the Computer Based Test and all subsequent stages of recruitment for Manager (Law), subject to the final outcome of the present petition and without creation of any special equity in his favour;

(C) Issue a further writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to decide the Petitioner's Representation dated 23.07.2026 (Annexure P-6) by a reasoned and speaking order dealing with the statutory and constitutional objections raised therein, if the same has not already been decided, and communicate the decision to the petitioner forthwith;

(D) Issue a further writ in the nature of Mandamus to stay the operation of the Impugned part of Clause 8(c) of The Airports Authority of India (Recruitment and Promotion) Amendment Regulations, 2026, dated 11.02.2026 and Note (VI) of Advertisement No. 12/2026/CHQ/DR-CHT, dated 22.07.2026 (Annexure P-1), during the pendency of the present writ petition before this Hon'ble Court;

(E) To pass such other or further Writ, Order or direction as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case."

2. The petitioner, who appears in person, challenges the stipulation in



the notification issued by the Airports Authority of India for making appointments in the Airports Authority of India on certain posts, more specifically for the post of Manager (Law), Code 6.

3. One of the submissions of the petitioner is that the representation dated 23.07.2026 has not been decided by the Airports Authority of India.

4. Learned counsel appearing for Airports Authority of India states that the representation is under consideration, the decision thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner within ten days from today. The submission is taken on record.

5. The petition is disposed of. Pending application is disposed of.

6. It goes without saying that if the petitioner still has any grievance, liberty shall be with the petitioner to seek such remedy as available against the order to be passed by the respondent on his representation.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

AUGUST 21, 2026/msh