



\$~68

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

+ W.P.(C) 3145/2025
VIPIN KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sumit Goswami, Advocate
with petitioner.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI
SECRETARY & ORS.

THROUGH ITS CHIEF

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC with Ms.
Laavanya Kaushik, Ms. Aliza
Alam, Advocates for GNCTD.
Mr. Nischal Joshi, Advocate for
BIS.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

12.03.2025

CM APPL. 14841/2025 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 3145/2025 & CM APPL. 14840/2025 (for stay)

1. The petitioner was serving in the respondent No. 4 – Bureau of India Standards [“BIS”] as a Graduate Engineer in the Registration Department from 01.12.2015 to 31.05.2019. He has since participated in a recruitment advertised by the respondent No. 2 - Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board, for the post of Senior Scientific Assistant (Document) in the Forensic Science Laboratory, Delhi [“FSL”]. The



petitioner has been offered appointment by a letter dated 03.07.2023, but has not yet been issued a joining letter.

2. It appears from the contents of the writ petition that there is some ongoing correspondence between the petitioner, FSL and BIS with regard to the nature of duties and responsibilities, which the petitioner discharged during his employment with BIS. The petitioner has placed on record a copy of letter dated 11.09.2024, addressed by him to the Director of FSL, enumerating the nature of his duties in BIS. He has also addressed an email dated 14.12.2024 to BIS from which it appears that FSL has also been in communication with BIS in this regard. It is the petitioner's contention that BIS had originally communicated his duties and responsibilities to FSL by an e-mail dated 08.03.2024, but thereafter issued a further communication on 06.06.2024, in which the details were incomplete. It appears that the petitioner's employment with FSL remains in suspension due to the aforesaid confusion.

3. As the appointment letter issued to the petitioner by FSL is almost two years old, I inquired of learned counsel for the parties as to whether the vacancy is still available. Ms. Aliza Alam, learned counsel for FSL, states that if the appointment letter had been cancelled, it would have been communicated to the petitioner. Mr. Sumit Goswami, learned counsel for the petitioner, states upon instructions from the petitioner, who is present on video conference, that no order of cancellation has been communicated to him.

4. FSL is directed to communicate any further information sought by them to the Human Resource Department of BIS, with copies to the petitioner, learned counsel for the petitioner, and learned counsel for BIS.



BIS is directed to respond to the same within two weeks thereafter, again copying all the aforesaid persons, after which FSL may proceed in accordance with law.

5. The writ petition is disposed of with the aforesaid directions.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MARCH 12, 2025

“Bhupi/AD”/