

\$~30 to 41.

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 8318/2017, 9158/2017, 9160/2017, 9162/2017, 9171/2017,
9255/2017, 9256/2017, 9288/2017, 9360/2017, 9364/2017, 9425/2017
and 9427/2017

SANDEEP KUMAR YADAV	 Petitioner
JITENDRA YADAV	 Petitioner
HITESH KUMAR YADAV	 Petitioner
SUBHASH CHAND	 Petitioner
CHARAN SINGH YADAV	 Petitioner
NAVEEN KUMAR YADAV	 Petitioner
MOHIT YADAV	 Petitioner
PARMENDAR KUMAR	 Petitioner
NITESH KUMAR	 Petitioner
DEEPAK KUMAR	 Petitioner
RINKU	 Petitioner
AMIT YADAV	 Petitioner

Through: Mr. Naveen Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. A.K. Trivedi, Adv. in W.P.(C) No. 8318/2017
Mr. Pallav Kumar, Advocate in W.P.(C) Nos.
9158/2017, 9160/2017, W.P.(C) 8318/2017 &
connected matters Page 2 of 14 9162/2017,
9171/2017, 9255/2017, 9256/2017, 9288/2017,
9360/2017, 9364/2017, 9425/2017, 9427/2017.
versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Prasant Varma, Sr. Central Govt.
Counsel for UOI with Ms. Shalu Goswami,
Advocate in W.P.(C) 8318/2017.
Mr. Gigi C. George, Advocate with Mr. Ramesh
Tiwari, Adv. with Mr. B.S. Chauhan, Commandant,
BSF for R-1 & R-2 in W.P.(C) Nos. 9158/2017,
9160/2017, 9162/2017, 9171/2017, 9255/2017,
9256/2017, 9288/2017, 9360/2017, 9364/2017 and
9427/2017.
Mr. Vijay Joshi, Advocate for UOI in W.P.(C)
No. 9425/2017.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

% **15.03.2018**

1. The present petitions have been listed on noticing two errors in the judgment dated 06.03.2018. The second sentence of para 9 is incomplete and is corrected to read as below:-

“9. Knowing very well that if they were not permitted to participate in the second phase of the examination, the petitioners would have entirely missed the bus, as the clock could not have been set back for them where thousands of candidates were to participate in the examination, they ought to have acted with alacrity.”

2. Further, the word ‘who’ is extraneous in para 17 of the judgment and ought to be deleted. Post deletion, para 17 shall read as below:-

“17. Another consideration that has weighed with this court for declining the request of the petitioners is that not only had the entire process of the examination concluded by the time they had approached the court for relief, if any relief is granted to any of them at this belated stage, it would have a cascading effect as other similarly placed candidates shall start knocking at the doors of the court asking for similar relief, which is impermissible.”

3. This order shall be read as a part and parcel of the common judgment dated 06.03.2018.

HIMA KOHLI, J

PRATIBHA RANI, J

MARCH 15, 2018

rkb

W.P.(C) 8318/2017 and connected matters