



\$~72

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

Date of decision: 13.05.2025

+ W.P.(C) 6259/2025
STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION, THROUGH ITS
CHAIRMAN & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr.Prem Shankar Singh, CGSC

versus

DESHBANDHU

.....Respondent

Through: Nemo.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPL. 28579/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 6259/2025 & CM APPL. 28578/2025

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioners, challenging the Order dated 20.08.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal') in O.A. No.1421/2024, titled ***Deshbandhu v. SSC & Anr.***, whereby the learned Tribunal allowed the said O.A. filed by the respondent herein, with the following directions:-

"6. In view of the decision taken by this Tribunal in various OAs, we cannot take a



divergent view in the present matter. Accordingly, the OA is also disposed of with a direction to the competent authority/respondent to conduct a fresh medical examination of the applicant by way of constituting an appropriate medical board in any government hospital except the hospital which has already conducted the initial and the review medical examination. Appropriate orders with respect to the candidature of the applicant on the basis of the outcome of such an independent/fresh medical examination be passed thereafter under intimation to the applicant.

7. The aforesaid directions shall be complied with within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. In the event the applicant is being declared medically fit, subject to his meeting other criteria, he shall be given appointment forthwith. The applicant, in such an eventuality, shall also be entitled to grant of all consequential benefits, however, strictly on notional basis. No costs.”

3. The present petition has been filed only on 27.04.2025, that is, after almost 8 months. There is absolutely no justification given for this delay in filing of the petition.

4. In this regard, we may draw reference to the Judgment of the Supreme Court in **Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply & Sewerage Board v. T.T. Murali Babu**, (2014) 4 SCC 108, wherein the Court has held as under:-

“16. Thus, the doctrine of delay and laches should not be lightly brushed aside. A writ court is required to weigh the explanation offered and the acceptability of the same. The court should bear in mind that it is exercising an extraordinary and equitable jurisdiction. As a constitutional court it has a duty to protect



the rights of the citizens but simultaneously it is to keep itself alive to the primary principle that when an aggrieved person, without adequate reason, approaches the court at his own leisure or pleasure, the court would be under legal obligation to scrutinise whether the lis at a belated stage should be entertained or not. Be it noted, delay comes in the way of equity. In certain circumstances delay and laches may not be fatal but in most circumstances inordinate delay would only invite disaster for the litigant who knocks at the doors of the court. Delay reflects inactivity and inaction on the part of a litigant — a litigant who has forgotten the basic norms, namely, “procrastination is the greatest thief of time” and second, law does not permit one to sleep and rise like a phoenix. Delay does bring in hazard and causes injury to the lis.”

5. From the above, it is apparent that although there is no prescribed period of limitation for filing a writ petition, delay and laches may nonetheless defeat the petitioners’ right to challenge the impugned order, as it could cause prejudice to the opposite party.

6. We, accordingly, dismiss the present petition only on the grounds of delay and laches. The pending application also stands dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

MAY 13, 2025/rv/DG

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)