



\$~49

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10821/2024**

RAVI PAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhay Kumar Bhargava and Mr.
Satyaarth Sinha, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms Kangan Roda, Adv. SPC with Mr.
Rajesh Kumar Singh, Legal Officer and Shiv
Kumar Singh, SI, GD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINDER KAUR

ORDER

%

06.08.2024

W.P.(C) 10821/2024 & CM APPL. 44556/2024 –Int. dir.

1. The petitioner who is serving as a Constable/GD in Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF), has approached this Court seeking the following reliefs:

“Issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other writ order or direction thereby directing the DIG (RR) CRPF that the petitioner be allowed to undergo Detailed Medical Examination (i.e., the Scheduled Stage-V of the LDCE Examination) as the petitioner has already qualified the Written Exam, Physical Measurement Test and Physical Efficiency Test and further direct the DIG (RR) CRPF that if the petitioner is declared qualified in the Detailed



Medical Examination then he may be recruited to the post of Head Constable/GD w.e.f. 06.05.2024 i.e., seniority at par with other candidates who recruited through the subject LDCE.

(ii) Pass any other order in the interest of Justice.”

2. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has reason to believe that in the Limited Department Competition Examination (LDCE) for the post of Head Constable (GD) held in 2020, even though he had obtained higher marks than the last candidate in the select list, he has arbitrarily been excluded from the select list. Further, despite, his repeated requests, the respondents have not informed the petitioner about the marks obtained by him.
3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents, who appears on advance notice, submits that the petitioner's belief that he had obtained more marks than the last selected candidate is without any basis. He submits that the marks obtained by the petitioner alongwith the marks and details of the last candidate in the select list will be duly communicated to him.
4. In the light of the aforesaid stand taken by the parties, we are of the opinion that in the first instance the respondents should inform the petitioner about the marks obtained by him alongwith the marks and details of the last selected candidate so that in case he still has any grievance, he can file a fresh comprehensive petition.
5. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of by directing the respondents to inform the petitioner within two weeks the marks



obtained by him in the aforesaid selection process alongwith the details and marks obtained by the last selected candidate. We, however, make it clear that if the petitioner still has any grievance regarding his non-selection, it will be open for him to seek legal recourse as per law. Needless to state, since we have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the writ petition, while initiating any further legal proceedings, it will be open for the petitioner to raise all grounds including the grounds raised in the present petition.

REKHA PALLI, J

SHALINDER KAUR, J

AUGUST 6, 2024
acm