



\$~87, 88 & 90

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

+ W.P.(C) 15878/2025, CM APPL. 64963/2025 & CM APPL. 64964/2025
PRIYA YADAV AND ORS.Petitioners

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents

+ W.P.(C) 15890/2025, CM APPL. 64987/2025 & CM APPL. 64988/2025
SHIKHAR BHADAURIAPetitioner

versus

NATIONAL EDUCATION SOCIETY FOR TRIBAL STUDENTSRespondent

+ W.P.(C) 15906/2025, CM APPL. 65016/2025 & CM APPL. 65017/2025
LAKHAN KUMAR GUPTAPetitioner

versus

NATIONAL EDUCATION SOCIETY FOR TRIBAL STUDENTS AND ORS.Respondents

Appearance:

Mr. Mayank Sharma, Advocate for petitioner for 87, 88 & 90.
Mr. Somesh Chandra Jha, Advocate for NESTS in Item No. 87, 88 & 90.
Mr. Siddharth Khatana (SPC) with Mr. Sanjay Pal, GP in Item No. 87.
Mr. Jitender Kumar Tripathi, SPC with Mr. Mrityunjay Mahendra, GP in Item No. 88 & 90.
Mr. Abhishek Yadav, SPC and Mr. Vipul Kumar, GP in Item No. 90.



CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER
15.10.2025

%

1. These three petitions, filed by twenty-three petitioners in total, concern a recruitment notification published by the National Education Society for Tribal Students [“NESTS”] on 19.09.2025. The principal contention of the petitioners is that the eligibility criteria stipulated in the notification for the post of Trained Graduate Teacher (Physical Education) are contrary to the Recruitment Rules of NESTS. For this purpose, the petitioners have placed on record the Eklavya Model Residential School Recruitment Rules published by NESTS on 02.06.2023.

2. Mr. Somesh Chandra Jha, learned counsel for NESTS, who appears on advance notice, submits that the petitioners have failed to place on record the revised Recruitment Rules, which were published by NESTS on 19.09.2025. The revised Rules are available in the public domain on the NESTS website but have not been referenced in the writ petitions at all.

3. Mr. Mayank Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that in view of the revised Recruitment Rules, the grievances raised in these writ petitions do not survive. He, therefore, seeks permission to withdraw the writ petitions.

4. The writ petitions, alongwith the pending applications, are dismissed as withdrawn.

5. Mr. Sharma submits that in the case of one or two petitioners, they



fall within the eligibility conditions as properly understood. That contention is left open for consideration at the appropriate stage, if required. Mr. Jha disputes this position, but it is not necessary to consider this aspect in the context of the petitions presently filed.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

OCTOBER 15, 2025
SS/JM/