



\$~51

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

+ LPA 1202/2024 & CM APPL. 72922/2024

SUMIT KUMAR AND ORS

.....Appellants

Through: Mr Kamlesh Kumar Mishra, Ms
Shivani Verma, and Ms Renu, Adv.

versus

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Avnish Ahlawat, SC with Mr. N.
K. Singh, Ms. Laavanya Kaushi, Ms.
Alza Alam and Mr. Mohnish
Sehrawat, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER

%

12.12.2024

1. The appellants have filed the present appeal impugning an order dated 22.11.2024 (hereafter *the impugned order*) passed by the learned Single Judge in CM APPL 68424/2024 in W.P.(C) No.16253/2024 captioned *Sumit Kumar & Others v. Lieutenant Governor & Others* whereby the said application was dismissed.
2. The appellants had filed the said application, *inter alia*, seeking stay of the recruitment process for the appointment of Home Guards. It is the case of the appellants, who have participated in the said process pursuant to the advertisement dated 24.01.2024 issued by the Directorate of Home Guard, Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi, that they were successful in the physical examination as well as the written examination. However, the results have not been disclosed as yet.
3. The appellants state that the advertisement was for the recruitment of 10,285 number of vacancies, however, the merit result was disclosed only for 1412 number of candidates and the appellants are clueless as to their position in the order of merit.



4. The learned counsel for the appellants state that the appellants are aggrieved by the observations to the effect that they had not qualified the examination and are not in the merit list.
5. A plain reading of the impugned order indicates that the application filed by the appellants for the stay of the selection process has been denied, and in our view, rightly so.
6. The grievance of the appellants is regarding the non-disclosure of their results. Clearly, the said grievance does not warrant a stay of the selection process. The observations made by the learned Single Judge to the effect that none of the appellants have qualified in the merit list, is an observation in the context of annexure P5 of the writ petition. Even according to the learned counsel for the respondents, the final list has not been disclosed as yet.
7. In view of the above, we find no grounds to interfere with the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge. However, we request the respondents to file the status report in the pending writ petition preferred by the appellants within the period of four weeks from date clearly setting out the current status of the appellants in the selection process as well as any further litigation that is pending before the Courts or Tribunals to enable the learned Single Judge to take an informed decision.
8. The appeal is disposed of in the aforesaid terms. Pending application also stands disposed of.

VIBHU BAKHRU, ACJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

DECEMBER 12, 2024

M

Click here to check corrigendum, if any