



\$~27

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

+ **W.P.(C) 14740/2025**

SAMYUKTA MENON

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. S S Pandey, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain,
CGSC, Mr. Kautilya Birat with Major Anish
Muralidhar

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

ORDER

%

05.12.2025

REVIEW PET. 605/2025

1. Mr. Swain, learned CGSC arguing the review petition submits that there is an error in para 13 of judgment dated 30 October 2025 of which review is sought, which reads thus:

“13. In that view of the matter, as the issue is squarely covered, we allow this writ petition by directing that the petitioner would be entitled for being recruited as SSC Officers against the unfilled male vacancies, as, given her merit position, she will qualify for selection thereagainst.”

2. Mr. Swain's contention is that there is no unfilled male vacancy.



3. Mr. Pandey, learned counsel for the petitioner, has drawn our attention to the earlier order dated 26 September 2025 passed by us in which we have specifically observed thus:

“27. We are informed that the second vacancy which was subject matter of the proceedings before the Supreme Court in **Arshnoor Kaur**¹ is still unfilled.

28. If this vacancy is allowed to be filled, this writ petition would be rendered infructuous and, therefore, irreparable prejudice would result to the petitioner. The balance of convenience would also, therefore, be in favour of passing limited interim directions pending disposal of the writ petition.

29. Accordingly, we direct, that, till the next date of hearing, the unfilled vacancy which was subsequent to the proceedings in **Arshnoor Kaur** shall not be filled or diverted to any other category or carried forward pending disposal of the present writ petition.”

4. No modification or review of the order dated 26 September 2025 has been sought by the respondent. As such, it is clear that there was one unfilled male vacancy available. The ground urged by Mr. Swain is, therefore, devoid of merit.

5. The review petition is dismissed.

C.HARI SHANKAR, J

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

DECEMBER 5, 2025/yg

¹Arshnoor Kaur v. Union of India, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1668

W.P.(C) 14740/2025