

\$~25

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

+ W.P.(C) 6203/2016

SUDHIR KUMAR & ORS

..... Petitioners

Represented by: None.

versus

DEPUTY COMMANDANT
(RECRUITMENT CELL) I.T.B.P.

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr.Rakesh Kumar, CGSC with
Mr.Suresh C. Sati, CGP and
Mr.Nishant Yadav, Dy. JAG,
ITBP

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP NANDRAJOG

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

21.07.2016

1. On July 20, 2016 following order was passed:

“1. At the second call request is made for hearing to be deferred on account of non-availability of the counsel.

2. We find that three counsel have filed the writ petition and all of them are based in the Supreme Court.

3. At least one could have appeared.

4. Be that as it may renotify for July 21, 2016.”

2. None appears for the petitioners today even at the second call.

3. We had expected nobody to appear for the petitioners for the reason the petitioners have not been appointed as Constable (Driver) in ITBP. On the strength of more marks obtained at the written test the petitioners make a

grievance that they are not satisfied with the result of the skill test.

4. Suffice it to note that final selection was on the basis of merit drawn by aggregating the marks obtained at the written examination as also the skill test.

5. We find the laconic averment in the writ petition that the petitioners are not satisfied with the result of the skill test, are neither here nor there. What was the skill test to which the candidates were subjected to has not been disclosed. What are the facts on which the petitioners claim they not being satisfied with the skill test has not been disclosed. There is no averment.

6. Be that as it may, since none appears for the petitioners even today, the writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

7. No costs.

PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

JULY 21, 2016

'hkaur'