

\$~7

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1665/2018, C.M. APPL.6841-6842/2018**

PAWAN KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through : Dr. K.S. Chauhan, Sh. Ravi Prakash, Sh. Ajit Kumar Ekka, Sh. Murari Lal and Sh. R.S.M. Kalky, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through : Sh. Dev. P. Bhardwaj, CGSC and Sh. Jatin Teotia, Advocate.

Sh. N.K. Singh and Ms. Sakshi Shairwal, Advocates.

Sh. Karthik Sundar, Advocate, for DHC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

26.03.2019

This Court had by an interim order permitted the petitioner to compete in the examination for selection to the Delhi Higher Judicial Service (DHJS) in accordance with the rules. His grievance is that the age relaxation required by the instructions of the Department of Personnel and Training (DOPT) were not incorporated in the appropriate instructions and notifications covering the DHJS recruitment rules. The petitioner had relied on the Constitution Bench judgment in *Rohtas Bhankhar v. Union of India* 2014 (8) SCC 872.

In the light of these submissions, the Court had permitted the petitioner and like candidates to compete in the preliminary examination. Apparently, the petitioner did not qualify in the preliminary examination. As a consequence, the claim in the petition cannot be granted and the question urged has been rendered moot. In the circumstances, the petition is dismissed as infructuous. The issue is, however, left open.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MARCH 26, 2019/AJK