

\$~8

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

+ W.P.(C) 8542/2015 & CM Nos. 18393-18394/2015

MEHAR SINGH & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC for R-1 to R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE DEEPA SHARMA

ORDER

%

07.09.2015

The petitioners' grievance is that their names do not figure in the Select List published by the respondents pursuant to the Central Armed Police Forces (CAPF) Entrance Examination held in 2011. The petitioners rely upon the previous order of this Court in W.P.(C) No. 5663/2013 where taking note of certain irregularities such as the omission of candidates who had failed to fill certain parts of the application form, the Court had granted the relief. Learned Counsel has placed on record a copy of the said judgment delivered on 14.07.2014. The petitioners concededly competed in the examination and undertook the recruitment process in 2011. The Select List in this case was first published on 28.11.2011. The cut-off marks of the

candidates for each category in respect of the various services was clearly indicated. Having regard to this fact, the petitioners seeking relief at this late stage in our opinion, cannot compel the Court to undertake an investigation into the facts. Reliance placed upon the subsequent revised Select List by the petitioners in this Court's opinion is not relevant. These subsequent Select Lists were revised pursuant to specific orders of the Court, at the instance of candidates who were initially declared medically unfit but later upon review found to be fit or at the instance of others whose applications were rejected on some technicalities such as not having filled certain particulars in the application form. Having regard to the fact that the Select List was published on 28.11.2011 in respect of about 47000 vacancies, entertaining these proceedings after almost 4 years, would not be in public interest. Moreover, the petitioners have approached the Court after undue and unexplained delay.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed on the ground of delay and laches.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

DEEPA SHARMA, J

SEPTEMBER 07, 2015

sapna