

\$~5

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

% *Date of Decision: 20th March, 2023*

+ W.P.(C) 9463/2018 & CM APPL. 36736/2018, 36737/2018,
36738/2018

PANKAJ PRAJAPATI Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

THE CHAIRMAN, DELHI SUBORDINATE SERVICES
SELECTION BOARD & ORS. Respondents

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, Standing
Counsel with Ms. Tania Ahlawat,
Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms. Palak
Rohmetra, Ms. Laavanya Kaushik and
Ms. Aliza Alam, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

JUDGEMENT

JYOTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. There is no appearance on behalf of the Petitioner.
2. Even on the last date of hearing, there was no appearance on behalf of the Petitioner.
3. The Court has perused the relief claimed in the present writ petition, which is a challenge to the recruitment process initiated pursuant to the Advertisement No. 04/17.
4. Learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the Respondents submits that the issue involved in the present writ petition is now covered by an order dated 03.12.2018 passed by a Division Bench of this Court in *W.P.(C) 13012/2018* titled as *Aditi Kumari v. The Chairman Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board and Ors.*

5. This Court has perused the order passed in *Aditi Kumari (supra)* and finds that in paragraph 5, the Division Bench has held that the candidates for the post of TGT (Social Science) (Male) had not competed for the post of TGT (Social Science) (Female) and *vice versa* and the candidates appearing for the online examination were subjected to the same terms. Thus, there was no question of any discrimination against the Petitioner therein, who was a female candidate for the post of TGT (Social Science) (Female), since the male candidates were not even competing for the post of TGT (Social Science) (Female). Para 5 of the order is extracted hereunder for ready reference:-

“5. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, we are of the view that the present petition is completely meritless. As noticed above, separate sanctioned posts exist in respect of TGT (Social Science) (Male) Post Code 137/17 and TGT (Social Science) (Female) Post Code 138/17. The candidates for the post of TGT (Social Science) (Male) had not competed for the post of TGT (Social Science) (Female) and vice versa. Candidates appearing for the online examination for the same post were being subjected to the same terms. Thus, there is no question of any discrimination against the petitioner, who is a female candidate for the post of TGT (Social Science) (Female) since the male candidates were not even competing for the post of TGT (Social Science) (Female). The grievance raised by the petitioner with regard to the mechanism in which the online examination is undertaken, namely, that the candidates have to first answer the questions in Part ‘A’ and thereafter proceed to attempt the question in Part ‘B’ is also meritless. All female candidates who had taken the online examination were subjected to the same rigour. Thus, there is no discrimination between the female candidates. To say that the petitioner should have been granted the same facility of attempting any question as she chooses has no merit since the same discipline binds all the female candidates. We may observe that the conduct of the online and offline mode of examination is a decision which the administration has to take keeping in view the logistics, number of candidates undertaking examination, the availability of examination hall and invigilators for the same and such like issues.”

Neutral Citation Number: 2023:DHC:1992

6. In view of the above, this Court finds no merit in the present writ petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.
7. Pending applications also stand dismissed.

MARCH 20, 2023/rk

JYOTI SINGH, J

