



\$~52

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

+ W.P.(C) 12713/2025
BHARAT KUMAR & ANR.Petitioners
Through: Mr. Harinath Ram, Advocate.

versus

INDIAN FARMERS FERTILISER
COOPERATIVE LTD. & ORS.Respondents
Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

% **ORDER**
22.08.2025

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:

“a) Issue Writ of Mandamus any other appropriate writ/order or direction to the Respondent No. 1 to 3 to appoint the petitioners at the appropriate post of job in its organization i.e., Respondent No. 1 as per similar appointed persons since 2021 till 2025.

b) Pass any other further order(s) which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper under the facts and circumstances mentioned hereinabove, in the interest of justice.”

2. The petitioners, who are siblings, state that they have both completed MBA degrees in HR and Marketing, and seek appointment to the positions in IFFCO in respondent No. 1 – Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Limited [“IFFCO”], suitable to their qualifications.

3. Mr. Harinath Ram, learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that



the petitioners have not applied in response to any advertisement or recruitment notification issued by IFFCO, but have made representations seeking appointment. Copies of these representations, and petitioners' respective resumes attached thereto, are on record. It is contended by the petitioners, that several persons have been similarly appointed to posts without following due procedure or through outsourcing agencies, and that such appointments are arbitrary and illegal.

4. However, the petitioners have not challenged the appointment of any other person in IFFCO, nor have any of the appointed persons been impleaded as respondents in the present writ petition. The only plea advanced is that the petitioners themselves be similarly appointed.

5. In these circumstances, the writ of *mandamus* is not available to the petitioners. They contend that the persons appointed were selected illegally, and without following due procedure. No legal right can, therefore, flow to the petitioners. A plea for appointment on the same basis is tantamount to a request to perpetuate the alleged illegality.

6. The writ petition is disposed of with these observations. It is, however, clarified that if the petitioners wish to challenge the appointments of persons allegedly appointed illegally, they are at liberty to do so in accordance with law.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

AUGUST 22, 2025/“Bhupi/sd”/