



\$~52

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10280/2024**

RAYANI SHANMUKHA SAI VARDHANPetitioner

Through: **Mr. V.S. Reddy, Advocate.**

versus

**RAMAGUNDAM FERTILIZERS
AND CHEMICALS LTD. & ANR.**Respondents

Through: **Mr. Dipak Kumar Jena, Mr. Raj
Shekhar Jena and Mr. Ashutosh
Singhdeo, Advocates.
Mr. Vinay Yadav, SPC with Mr.
Ansh Kalra, Ms. Kamna Behrani
and Mr. Divyanshu Sinha,
Advocates for UOI.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER
% **09.04.2025**

1. The petitioner applied for the post of Junior Engineering Assistant Grade – II (Production) advertised by the respondent on 10.02.2024. He assails an order dated 27.06.2024, by which he was held to be ineligible on the ground that he did not possess the essential qualification in line with the advertisement.

2. Although a contention has been taken in the counter affidavit that the petitioner's grievances are amenable to the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal ["Tribunal"] [Para 5 (VIII)], Mr. Dipak Kumar

W.P.(C) 10280/2024

Page 1 of 4



Jena, learned counsel for the respondent submits that this averment was made in error, and the respondent is not amenable to the jurisdiction of the Tribunal. The writ petition has therefore been heard on merits.

3. The advertisement concerned recruitment to various non-executive posts, including the post of Junior Engineering Assistant Grade – II (Production). The essential educational qualifications advertised for the said post were as follows:

“B.Sc. with Physics, Chemistry & Mathematics Or Diploma in Chemical Engineering/Technology”

[Emphasis supplied]

4. It was also provided in the advertisement as follows:

“(a) Candidate must possess the above mentioned essential/mandatory Educational Qualification (Col. iv). No claim of possession of equivalent educational qualification(s) other than advertised educational qualification for a post would be entertained and decision of RFCL in this regard would be final and binding. In case of any dispute arising about admissibility of any particular qualification, the decision of RFCL Management shall be final and binding on the applicants.”

5. It is stated in the petition that the petitioner has a three year Bachelor’s in Science [“B.Sc.”] degree from the University of Mumbai. He has annexed to the writ petition, copies of his marksheets for each of the six semesters, which are headed “*Five Year integrated M.Sc. degree*”, although the petitioner claims only to have earned a B.Sc. degree. He has also annexed a copy of his degree certificate issued by the University of Mumbai, which states that he has been awarded the B.Sc. (Physics) degree.

6. In the counter affidavit, the position taken by the respondent is that candidates were required to have a Bachelor’s Degree with Physics,



Chemistry and Maths, but the petitioner's did not include Chemistry and Mathematics.

7. The respondent has thus proceeded on the basis that the petitioner's degree is not compliant with the advertisement notification, as he did not have a B.Sc. degree with Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics. This position is *ex-facie* borne out by the degree finally conferred on the petitioner, which refers only to a B.Sc. in Physics.

8. It is the petitioner's contention, however, that the courses taken by him during his degree included courses in Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics, which renders him eligible for the post in question. In support of this contention, learned counsel for the petitioner draws my attention to the Semester Grade Reports.

9. Taking the question with regard to Chemistry first, the Semester Grade Reports show that in each of the first and second semesters, the petitioner had taken 3 credit courses in Chemistry and 2 credit course in Chemistry Laboratory. No other Chemistry courses have been mentioned. The total number of credits taken by the petitioner, as evident from the Grade Reports, is 145 credits, out of which a total of 10 credits is thus attributable to courses in Chemistry.

10. Matters of evaluation of qualifications *viz-a-viz* recruitment advertisements are generally a matter in which considerable deference is shown to the employer. The judgment of the Supreme Court make it clear that the Court's expertise in the matter of academic assessment is limited. Absent manifest arbitrariness or unreasonableness, the view of the employer should be accepted. *All India Council for Technical Education*



v. Surinder Kumar Dhawan & Ors¹. and The Secretary, All India Shri Shivaji Memorial Society (AISSMS) and Ors. v. The State of Maharashtra and Ors. and other connected matters².

11. Having regard to the fact that the petitioner's degree only mentions Physics as a subject of his Bachelor of Science degree, and noticing the limited number of courses he had taken in Chemistry, I find no arbitrariness in the view taken by the respondent that the degree does not qualify as a B.Sc. degree with Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics.

12. For the aforesaid reasons, I am unable to accept the case made out by the petitioner. The writ petition is, therefore, dismissed.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 9 2025/uk/kb

¹ (2009) 11 SCC 726.

² SLP (C) No. 7058-7061 of 2019 and other connected matters, decided on 01.04.2025.