



2025:DHC:9520-DB



\$~37

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

Date of decision: 29.10.2025

+ W.P.(C) 16395/2025
MAMTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms.Pratima Gupta, Mr.V.K.
Singh, Ms.Divya Arora and
Mr.Ishan Parashar, Advs.

versus

EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION &
ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Shlok Chandra, SC with
Mr.Parikshit Singh Bhati, Adv.
for R-1 & R-2

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPLs. 67162-63/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

**W.P.(C) 16395/2025 & CM APPL. 67161/2025, CM APPL.
67164/2025**

2. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 25.07.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the, 'Tribunal') in O.A. 2807/2025, titled *Mamta v. Employees' State Insurance*



2025:DHC:9520-DB



Corporation & Anr., whereby the learned Tribunal dismissed the said O.A. filed by the petitioner herein as being barred by limitation.

3. In the aforesaid O.A., the petitioner had challenged her non-selection to the post of Upper Division Clerk under the Other Backward Classes (OBC) category in the selection process initiated by the respondents through an Advertisement dated 24.12.2011. The result of the selection process was declared on 01.08.2012. The petitioner, however, filed the O.A. before the learned Tribunal only in July 2025.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in the interregnum, the petitioner had approached the learned National Commission for Scheduled Castes, New Delhi in 2014 with her complaint. The said complaint was thereafter transferred to the learned National Commission for Backward Classes *vide* letter dated 06.11.2019, where it was entertained. She submits that, as she did not receive any response from the learned National Commission for Backward Classes, she finally approached the learned Tribunal in the form of the above O.A.

5. We are unable to find any merit in the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. The fact remains that the selection process in question pertains to the year 2011 and culminated in the year 2012. More than thirteen years have since lapsed. It is a settled principle that no person has a vested right in a selection process. Entertaining the OA at this belated stage would have resulted in reopening a process which is long settled.



2025:DHC:9520-DB



7. In view of these facts, we find that the petitioner has failed to satisfactorily explain the inordinate delay in filing the O.A.
8. We, therefore, do not find any infirmity in the Order passed by the learned Tribunal.
9. The petition, along with the pending applications, is accordingly dismissed.
10. There shall be no order as to costs.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

OCTOBER 29, 2025/ns/Yg