

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8474/2018 and CM APPL. 32557-32558/2018**

Reserved on: 20.08.2018

Date of decision: 04.09.2018

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**ANU KUMARI**

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sudhir Nandrajog, Sr. Advocate with  
Mr. Swastik Singh and Mr. Raghu Vasisht,  
Advocates

versus

**UNION OF INDIA & ANR**

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, CGSC with  
Ms. Saakshi Agrawal, Advocate for R-1.  
Mr. Naresh Kaushik with Mr. Omung Gupta,  
Advocates for R-2/UPSC.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI**

**HIMA KOHLI, J.**

1. Aggrieved by the order dated 31.07.2018, passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi, rejecting O.A. No.2635/2018 filed by the petitioner, a successful candidate in the Central Civil Services Examination, 2017 (in short '**CSE, 2017**'), assailing the letters dated 13.02.2018 and 21.02.2018 issued by the respondent No.2/UPSC, rejecting her preferences for Zones and Cadre allocation, she has approached this Court for relief.

2. The facts of the case lie in a narrow compass. The respondent No.2/Union Public Service Commission (in short 'UPSC') conducts Civil Services Examinations on an annual basis for recruitment to the IAS, IFS, IPS and other Central Services in Group 'A' and 'B'. The said scheme of examination is commonly known as the Civil Services Examination and comprises of two stages, namely, Civil Services (Preliminary) Examination and Civil Services (Main) Examination. The second stage for selection of candidates is split into two stages, written examination and interview/personality test. The dispute in the present case relates to the CSE, 2017.

3. It is not in dispute that till the CSE, 2016, preferences of Cadre were obtained from candidates before sitting for the CS (Main) Examination when they were required to fill in the Detailed Application Form (in short 'DAF'). However, the said procedure was changed for the CSE, 2017 and this time, the candidates were informed that they would be notified for submitting their preferences of Cadres (for IAS/IPS) in due course of time through an Addendum to the DAF after the revised Cadre Allocation Policy of the Government becomes available. Later on, a Press Note was released by the respondents on 08.01.2018, declaring the results of the CS(Main) Examination and informing the candidates, who had provisionally qualified for the personality test/interview that they could fill up the Addendum to the DAF for submitting their Zones and Cadre preferences online and that the said Addendum will be available on the website of the respondent No.2/UPSC from 16.01.2018 to 29.01.2018 (06:00 PM).

4. The petitioner herein participated in the CSE, 2017 and cleared the Preliminary Examination conducted in May, 2017. The respondents issued an Office Memorandum dated 05.09.2017, informing all the candidates that they were required to give their preferences firstly for the Zones and lastly for the Cadre State they would like to serve in. It is the version of the petitioner that she had filled in her preferences on the last date, i.e., on 29.01.2018 and had tried to submit the same before the deadline but due to some glitch in the network, the link of the respondent No.2/UPSC stopped responding and therefore, she could not submit her Zones and Cadre preferences by 6:00 PM. However, without losing any time, the petitioner sent mails to the respondents on 29.01.2018 itself at 6:29 PM, drawing their attention to the difficulty faced by her in submitting her Cadre preferences before the deadline and stating that her saved preferences may be considered as her submission. On the very next day, i.e., on 30.01.2018, the petitioner, who is residing at Mohali, State of Punjab, had personally travelled to the office of the respondent No.2/UPSC at Delhi and submitted a written representation, highlighting the aforesaid difficulty. She had also mailed a similar representation to the respondent No.2/UPSC on the very same day, i.e., on 31.01.2018, followed by e-mails dated 07.02.2018 and 11.02.2018. On 13.02.2018, the respondent No.2/UPSC informed the petitioner that since she had failed to submit her preferences for the Zones and Cadres within the prescribed time period, her preference has been treated as 'NIL'.

5. On receiving the aforesaid reply, the petitioner wrote back to the respondent No.2/UPSC on the very same day, requesting that her case be considered on compassionate grounds. However, the respondent No.2/UPSC

flatly refused to do so and vide letter dated 21.02.2018, reiterated the stand taken by it on 13.02.2018. The petitioner has explained that in view of the impending personality test/interview, which was scheduled on 22.03.2018, she started focusing on her preparation.

6. Finally, when the results of the CSE, 2017 were declared by the respondent No.2/UPSC on 27.04.2018, it turned out that the petitioner had secured a 2<sup>nd</sup> position in the All India Ranking. On 09.05.2018, the petitioner again sent a representation followed by a reminder dated 23.05.2018 to the respondent No.1/Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, Government of India, requesting that her preferences for the Zones and Cadre be taken into consideration. On failing to receive any response, the petitioner approached the Central Administrative Tribunal and filed O.A. No.2635/2018 in the middle of June, 2018. Initially, the Tribunal had directed the respondents to keep one post vacant in the Haryana Cadre, which she had opted for, but later on, the impugned order came to be passed, dismissing the petitioner's application on the ground that there was no justification for her not to have exercised her preferences within the time provided and that the explanation offered by her for failing to adhere to the deadline, was unacceptable. It is the said decision that has been challenged before us.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Tribunal has failed to appreciate that the dispute herein pertains to the inability of the petitioner to submit her Cadre preferences on time and it is not as if she has sought some change/modification of the already submitted preferences and therefore, her case ought to have been treated on a different footing; that the Tribunal ought not to have disbelieved the petitioner when she had stated that she could not

submit her preferences for Zones and Cadre within the stipulated timeline due to some problem with the network and though she kept on trying to submit her preferences, the portal of the respondent No.2/UPSC had closed down; that the petitioner did not lose any time to highlight the above issue by sending an email to the respondent No.2/UPSC on 29.01.2018 itself, followed by a personal visit to their office at Delhi on the very next day and several rounds of representations and reminders issued thereafter. Learned counsel contended that the laws of procedures are devised to advance the cause of justice and not to impede the same and therefore, the Tribunal ought not to have taken such a technical view, particularly, keeping in mind the background from which the petitioner comes and her adverse circumstances, which have not prevented her from participating in and clearing such a tough examination with flying colours.

8. Countering the aforesaid submission, Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, learned counsel for the respondent No.1/IOI and Mr. Naresh Kaushik, learned counsel for the respondent No.2/UPSC defended the impugned order and contended that the petitioner has none else to blame except for herself for not giving her preferences of Zones and Cadre within the fixed timeline; that the excuse of network problem sought to be offered by the petitioner is unacceptable for the reason that between 16.01.2018 to 29.01.2018, the prescribed timeline for filling up the Addendum to the DAF, the petitioner had logged into the portal of the respondent No.2/UPSC on eight occasions, lastly on 25.01.2018, at 13:56 hours and the said login was a successful one but for reasons best known to her, she did not finally submit the form by clicking the button, as required. It was argued that contrary to the submission made by the petitioner that she had

saved the draft form by 29.01.2018 but could not submit the same finally due to network issues and in the meantime, the portal had closed down on the deadline expiring, there is no such login data available in the database of the respondent No.2/UPSC. Much stress was laid by learned counsels for the respondents on the fact that sufficient time had been granted to all the candidates to submit their preferences and a majority of them, amongst the list of recommended candidates, had done so before expiry of the deadline.

9. On his part, learned counsel for the respondent No.1/UOI had alluded to the reply filed before the Tribunal to explain that allocation of Cadre to the members of the All India Services is decided on the basis of rank, preferences and the number of vacancies available in a particular category, at the relevant point in time. The total number of vacancies which are further distributed amongst different Cadre, category-wise and insider and outsider wise, is equal to the number of candidates allocated to an All India Service from a particular CSE. In terms of the said preference system, officers compete for the vacancies as per their “*merit, preferences and available vacancy*”. In other words, if a particular candidate gets a vacancy, then the said vacancy is consumed and is not available to other candidates and so on and so forth. Learned counsel for the respondent No.1/UOI further clarified that notwithstanding the fact that the Cadre allocation for candidates to be allotted to the IAS on the basis of CSE, 2017 had not yet been finalized, the petitioner cannot be provided another opportunity to submit her preferences, having failed to exercise her option within the period so provided.

10. We have given our anxious consideration to the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties, carefully perused the pleadings on the record and examined the impugned order.

11. There is no dispute as to the manner in which the events have unfolded in this case, leading to filing of the present petition, nor is there any dispute on the various stages which a candidate must clear for being selected for the CSE, 2017. The only issue that arises for our consideration is as to whether the respondents ought to have accepted the petitioner's option of preferences of Zones/Cadre under the Cadre Allocation Policy declared vide OM dated 05.09.2017 and the Press Note dated 08.01.2018, released by the respondent No.1/UOI, by relaxing the deadline.

12. In the first instance, it is considered necessary to examine the OM dated 05.09.2017 issued by the respondent No.1/UOI on the Cadre Allocation Policy for the All India Services (IAS/IPS/IFoS), the relevant extract whereof is reproduced hereinbelow for ready reference:-

*“Subject: Cadre Allocation Policy for the All India Services- IAS/IPS/IFoS – Reg.*

*The undersigned is directed to say that the Central Government, after consultation with State Governments, has revised the policy for cadre allotment for the All India Services-Indian Administrative Service (IAS)/Indian Police Service (IPS)/Indian Forest Service (IFoS)- as follows:-*

XXX                      XXX                      XXX

*2. The States/Joint Cadres shall be divided into the following five Zones:*

- i.        Zone-I (AGMUT, Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Uttrakhand, Punjab, Rajasthan and Haryana*
- ii.      Zone-II (Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand and Odisha)*

- iii. Zone-III (Gujarat, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh)
- iv. Zone-IV (West Bengal, Sikkim, Assam-Meghalaya, Manipur, Tripura and Nagaland)
- v. Zone-V (Telangana, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Kerala)

3. The candidates shall first give their choice in the descending order of preference from amongst the various Zones. Thereafter the candidates will indicate one preference of cadre from each preferred zone. The candidates will indicate their second cadre preference for every preferred zone thereafter. Similar process will continue till a preference for all the cadres is indicated by the candidate. It is to be noted that preference for the zones will remain in the same order and no change in the order of preference for the zones/cadres will be permitted.

4. If a candidate does not give any preference for any of the Zones/Cadres, it will be presumed that he has no specific preference for those Zones/cadres. Accordingly, if he is not allocated to any one of the cadres for which he has indicated the preference, he shall be allotted along with other such candidates in the order of rank to any of the remaining cadres, arranged in an alphabetical order, in which there are vacancies in his category after allocation of all the candidates who can be allotted to cadres in accordance with their preference.

XXX                      XXX                      XXX

6. A candidate shall be allotted to his Home cadre, on the basis of his merit, preference and vacancy available at his turn in his category. For allocation to Home cadre against an Insider vacancy, a candidate will be required to express his first preference to the Zone in which his Home cadre falls as well as first preference to the Home cadre within that relevant Zone, otherwise he shall not be considered for his Home cadre at all.

XXX                      XXX                      XXX

8. The cadre allocation shall consist of three steps as follows:  
 (i) First, all those candidates who can be allocated against the Insider vacancies available in their category would be so allocated.

(ii) Second, the candidates who are eligible for allocation to their Home cadre as per Para 7 above will be allocated first as per clause(s) of Para 7 above. Even after this exchange as para 7 above, if an Insider vacancy cannot be filled, it would be converted to Outsider vacancy and filled as such and it would not be carried forward to next examination.

(iii) Finally, the allocation against Outsider vacancies (including the Outsider vacancies, which remained eventually unfilled after the allocation as per clause (i) and (ii) of para 8 above) would commence. Allocation against Outsider vacancies to candidates in respective categories shall be done in the following manner:

(a) The first choice for the Cadre in the first preferred Zone would be considered in the order of merit.

(b) If the candidate does not get allocated to the 1<sup>st</sup> preferred Cadre of his 1<sup>st</sup> preferred Zone, then he would be considered for the first preferred cadre of his 2<sup>nd</sup> preferred Zone and so on till the 1<sup>st</sup> preferred cadre of the 5<sup>th</sup> preferred Zone.

(c) If the candidate does not get allocated to the 1<sup>st</sup> preferred cadre(s) of any Zone, then he would be considered for the 2<sup>nd</sup> preferred cadre of the 1<sup>st</sup> preferred Zone and so on.

XXX XXX XXX”

13. Paras 5 and 6 of the Press Note dated 08.01.2018, is reproduced hereinbelow for purposes of ready reference:-

“5. At the time of filling up of Detailed Application Form (DAF), Cadre Preferences were not obtained from the candidates qualified for Civil Services (Main) Examination, 2017 and it was inter alia mentioned in Column 18 of DAF that the Revised Cadre Policy was under consideration in the Government (Department of Personnel and Training) for the All India Services. The Government has since issued the Cadre Allocation Policy on 05.09.2017, which is available on the DOP&T's website. In accordance with the Revised Cadre Allocation Policy, all the candidates, who have qualified for Personality Test (Interview), are requested to fill up the Addendum to DAF Online for submitting their Zones and Cadre Preferences. The

*Addendum to DAF will be made available on the Commission's website from 16/01/2018 to 29/01/2018 (06:00 PM). Candidate are advised to visit the website of Department of Personnel and Training at the link <http://persmin.gov.in/AIS1/OrvCA.asp> for perusing the Cadre Allocation Policy-2017. They are also advised to go through the details of the Cadre Allocation Policy 2017 extremely carefully before submitting their preferences for Zones as well as Cadres there under. The preferences once opted and submitted cannot be modified or changed at a later stage. Therefore, the candidates are advised to exercise due diligence while filling up the preferences for Zones as well as Cadres there under. If a candidate fails to submit the Addendum to DAF by last date/time, it will be considered that the candidate has no preference to make for Zones & Cadres and no request shall be entertained in this regard.*

*6. No request for any type of change/modification of information already supplied in DAF would be entertained by the Commission. However, wherever necessary the candidates are advised to notify changes in their address/contract details only, if any, to the Commission immediately through letter, email ([csm-upsc@gov.in](mailto:csm-upsc@gov.in)) or Fax at number indicated above within 7 days of publishing this Press Note."*

14. As can be gleaned from the OM dated 05.09.2017, read with the Press Note dated 08.01.2018, after the results of the CS (Main) Examination, 2017 were declared in January, 2018, all the provisionally selected candidates who had qualified for participating in the personality test/interview, were required to fill up the Addendum to the DAF online, specifying their Zones and Cadre preferences. Before doing so, the candidates had the option of previewing the form on the portal of the respondent No.2/UPSC. The said preferences were to be given in a descending order from amongst the five Zones detailed in para 2 of the OM dated 05.09.2017. Thereafter, the candidates were required to

indicate one preference of Cadre from each preferred Zone. The entire exercise of submitting their preferences was to be completed between 16.01.2018 to 29.01.2018 (06:00 PM).

15. Admittedly, the petitioner herein who was one of the candidates who had qualified for the personality test/interview, had logged onto the website of the respondent No.2/UPSC for a preview of the form and she had filled in the following preferences, but was late by 29 minutes in submitting the form on 29.01.2018, being the last day:-

“Whether you want to consider your Home State Haryana as your first preference as Home Cadre? - YES”

| Zones<br>(with<br>State<br>Cadres/<br>Joint<br>Cadres) | Order<br>of<br>prefer<br>ence<br>for<br>Zones | Order of Preference for State/Joint Cadre within Zone |           |                  |                 |           |             |             |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Zone I                                                 | 1                                             | AGMUT                                                 | Haryana   | Himachal Pradesh | Jammu & Kashmir | Punjab    | Rajasthan   | Uttarakhand |
|                                                        |                                               | 6                                                     | 1         | 4                | 99              | 3         | 2           | 5           |
| Zone II                                                | 3                                             | Bihar                                                 | Jharkhand | Odisha           | Uttar Pradesh   |           |             |             |
|                                                        |                                               | 2                                                     | 3         | 4                | 1               |           |             |             |
| Zone III                                               | 2                                             | Chhattisgarh                                          | Gujarat   | Madhya Pradesh   | Maharashtra     |           |             |             |
|                                                        |                                               | 4                                                     | 2         | 3                | 1               |           |             |             |
| Zone IV                                                | 99                                            | Assam-Meghalaya                                       | Manipur   | Nagaland         | Sikkim          | Tripura   | West Bengal |             |
|                                                        |                                               | 99                                                    | 99        | 99               | 99              | 99        | 99          |             |
| Zone V                                                 | 99                                            | Andhra Pradesh                                        | Karnataka | Kerala           | Tamil Nadu      | Telangana |             |             |
|                                                        |                                               | 99                                                    | 99        | 99               | 99              | 99        |             |             |

16. It is also not in dispute that after the Government undertook a review of the Cadre Allocation Policy, the aforesaid format for submitting Cadre preferences online, came to be notified by the respondents for the first time for the CSE, 2017. Given the facts of the present case, where such a novel

procedure of submitting online, an Addendum to the DAF on the basis of the revised Cadre Allocation Policy has been introduced by the respondents for the first time in the CSE, 2017, the confusion that might have prevailed in the mind of the petitioner in selection of her preferences, is not so difficult to understand. This dilemma in her mind is also reflected from the fact that the petitioner did log on to the website of the respondent No.2/UPSC on five occasions, for previewing the form and she had saved her preferences during the available timeline but had dithered when it came to clicking the button to finally submit the form. By the time she did so, the submission was late by 29 minutes.

17. This is also not a case where the draft preferences submitted by the petitioner on the website of the respondent No.2/UPSC are not available as the same have been retrieved from their data and filed by the respondent No.2/UPSC alongwith its counter affidavit and marked as Annexure R-2/6. If the Court accepts the submission of the respondents that once she had crossed the deadline for submitting her preferences for the Zones and Cadre, having delayed it by 29 minutes on 29.01.2018, they had no option but to invoke clause 4 of the OM dated 05.09.2017, then the petitioner, who has achieved a 2<sup>nd</sup> place in the All India ranking, would be faced with a bleak situation where her merit will be given a complete go-bye since her preferences would be treated as NIL, on a presumption that she had not given any preference for any Zone/Cadre.

18. Given the above position, it cannot be argued that the petitioner never had the intention of submitting her preferences for the Zones/Cadre. Shutting the door on her face at the very threshold of her career and that too for a delay of a few minutes would deprive the petitioner of her preferences of Zones and

Cadre, thereby negating the criteria of “*merit, preferences and vacancy available*”, prescribed in para 6 of the OM dated 05.09.2017.

19. Proceeding further, on accessing the website of the respondent No.2/UPSC ([upsc.gov.in](http://upsc.gov.in)), we find a vital footnote appended to the Examination Notice No.6/2017-CSP dated 22.02.2017, for the CSE, 2017, which throws light on the avowed goal of the respondents as it declares that:-

*“Government strives to have a workforce which reflects gender balance and women candidates are encouraged to apply.”*

20. Going by the Indian demography that reveals the percentage of female population was pegged at 48.18% in the year 2017, one would have expected that an elite cadre of the IAS would have had a robust number of woman officers. But that is not true. The grossly skewed ratio of representation of woman in the IAS is apparent from the available statistics relating to the number of women IAS officers in our country. There is only one woman IAS officer for every 20 male IAS officers. Over the years, the said number has been slowly creeping up. Against 88 women candidates recommended for appointment to the IAS in the year 2001, out of a total number of 417 candidates, it took a whole decade for the said figure to mount to 203 women candidates out of 921 candidates by the end of the year 2010. At this pace, it will take a long time for the pendulum to be equipoised so that the number of women in the IAS matches upto the percentage of the prevalent female population in the country. Thus, as of now, the laudable object of “gender balance in the workforce” sought to be achieved by the respondents, remains a pipe dream for myriad reasons. It is the above larger dimension that needs to be factored in while examining the issue in hand.

21. A quick glance at the petitioner's socio-economic background is considered expedient. The petitioner belongs to a lower middle class family residing in Sonipat, Haryana. Her family comprises of her father, who has retired from service, a mother, who is a homemaker and three siblings. The primary source of the family income is agricultural income. The petitioner has had a brilliant academic career in school and has graduated with a first division in the stream of Physics from an eminent college in the University of Delhi, followed by a first division in Masters of Business Administration from IMT, Nagpur. Immediately on completing her higher education in the year 2008, the petitioner started working in the private sector from June, 2008 itself to support her family. The petitioner's marriage was solemnized in the year 2012 and she has a four year old son. Due to personal differences, the petitioner is stated to be presently residing with her parents alongwith her son, who she is supporting as a single parent. Fuelled with the desire to join the prestigious Civil Services, besides working on a full-time basis, the petitioner has strived hard to prepare and participate in the CSE, 2017. It is her quest for social and economic empowerment that has made the petitioner achieve such a high position of No.2 in the All India ranking.

22. The petitioner's triumph against odds makes an inspirational story, likely to ignite thousands of dreams beating in the hearts of several women across the country, who would aspire to emulate or even surpass her achievement. The petitioner comes from a State where families have not focused much on imparting higher education to girls. Though belonging to the lower middle class, she has had the good fortune of having a supportive family that has equipped her with higher education and encouraged her to pursue her dreams

so as to break the cultural stereo types. When the respondents have embarked on the course of creating a workforce that reflects gender balance and have avowed a policy of encouraging women candidates to apply, then the onus lies on them to walk the talk and go that extra mile to provide a level playing field to women candidates, which in our opinion can be achieved in the present case, by taking into consideration the petitioner's meritorious performance and relaxing the deadline by 29 minutes for accepting her form of preferences of Zones and Cadre.

23. Looked at from another angle, one is left wondering as to what the petitioner would have gained in all this. As a matter of fact, she had everything to lose by filing a belated form and therefore, her plea of a technical glitch taking place in the network on the crucial day, cannot be discarded outright as has been done in the impugned judgment. It would be too harsh to visit the petitioner with such a serious consequence, as has been proposed by the respondents. Even otherwise, the decision to treat the petitioner's preferences as NIL, is found to be grossly disproportionate to the gravity of the lapse in adhering to the deadline prescribed by the respondents. The said timeline has been provided in the guidelines primarily for administrative convenience and to promote a smooth and efficient process culminating in a timely declaration of the results, and not to defeat the right of a successful candidate of exercising her preference, for bonafide reasons. We are thus of the view that depriving the petitioner of an opportunity to exercise her preferences of Zones and Cadre only on account of late submission of the form 29 minutes beyond the deadline, is unwarranted and iniquitous.

24. No doubt, allotment of Cadre is an incidence of service and a selected candidate has a right to be considered for appointment to the IAS but no right to be allotted a Zone or Cadre of his/her choice or to his/her Home State. However, in the present case, the petitioner has only requested for consideration of her preferences available with the respondent No.2/UPSC and not for a change or modification of the preferences already submitted by her. It is a different matter that once the said preferences are examined alongwith those submitted by other candidates, the exercise of Cadre allotment would be undertaken by the respondents in a clinical manner, purely on “*merit, preferences and vacancies*”. At that stage, the petitioner cannot seek or be granted any special privilege for allocation of the Cadre/Zone of her choice. Fortunately, for her, the said stage has yet to arrive as the respondents have not made the Cadre allocation for the candidates of the CSE, 2017 so far.

25. In view of the exceptional facts of the present case where a new system has been introduced by the respondents for the first time in CSE, 2017 that required candidates to submit online, their preferences of Zone and Cadre in a particular format, this Court is of the opinion that the said procedure does not require such a rigid interpretation so as to deprive the petitioner of exercising her right of preferences. Moreover, directing the respondents to consider the preferences of the petitioner, as already available with the respondent No.2/UPSC, will not jeopardize the interest of the other candidates as no rights have been crystallized so far, since the result of the cadre allocation has not been declared.

26. In view of the aforesaid discussion, the present petition succeeds. The impugned order dated 31.07.2018 passed by the Tribunal, is quashed and set

aside. The respondents are directed to consider the preferences of the petitioner in terms of Annexure R-2/6, extracted in para 15 above, along with those of the other candidates for purposes of allocation of Zones/Cadre. Before parting with the case, we may clarify that the relief granted to the petitioner herein is a one time exception made in the peculiar fact situation and will not be treated as the rule.

27. The petition is disposed of alongwith the pending applications with no orders as to costs.

**(HIMA KOHLI)**  
**JUDGE**

**(REKHA PALLI)**  
**JUDGE**

**SEPTEMBER 04, 2018**  
rkb/ap