



\$~29

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 11626/2024**
SHRI UDHAMPetitioner
Through: Mr. Rudraksha Sinha, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANRRespondents
Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, SPC with Ms.
Laavanya Kaushik and Mr. Ajay
Chaturvedi, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINDER KAUR

ORDER
23.08.2024

%

CM APPL. 48355/2024—Exp.

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 11626/2024

3. The petitioner, who is aspiring to join the Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) as a Constable (Fire), has approached this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking a direction to the respondents to grant permission to him to submit his documents for verification, upon verification thereof appoint him as a Constable (Fire) with retrospective seniority and all consequential benefits.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner had qualified in the written test as also the Physical Standard Test (PST) and the Physical Efficiency Test (PET), he could not appear for verification of his documents on 15.11.2023, the date fixed for verification of documents.



The petitioner, he contends, was suffering from typhoid on that date and therefore, made repeated representations to the respondents for granting him an opportunity to produce his documents. The respondents have, however, rejected his request, compelling the petitioner to approach this Court.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents, who appears on advance notice, submits that on 30.01.2024 itself, the petitioner was informed that the selection process had already been completed and therefore, his request for document verification could not now be considered. Furthermore, the petitioner had obtained only 47.64 marks in the selection exam as against the cut-off of 92.139 marks. She, therefore, contends that even if this Court were to permit the petitioner to submit his documents for verification, he would still not be selected. She, therefore, prays that the writ petition be dismissed.

6. In the light of this stand taken by the respondents that the marks obtained by the petitioner were far below the cut-off marks, we are of the view that even if we were to condone the gross delay and laches on the part of the petitioner in approaching the Court, no useful purpose would be served as the petitioner can due to his low merit still not be appointed. We, therefore, find no merit in the petition, which is accordingly dismissed.

REKHA PALLI, J

SHALINDER KAUR, J

AUGUST 23, 2024/ss