



2025:DHC:10927-DB



\$~20

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

Date of decision: 02.12.2025

+ W.P.(C) 16805/2024
LOKESH JAKHAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prateek Gupta, Mr. Raghav
Tiwari, Ms. Vishaka Kaushik,
Advs.

versus

STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rishabh Sahu SPC with
Mr. Arun Dhiman, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed challenging the Order dated 18.11.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal'), in O.A. 2619/2023, titled '*Lokesh Jakhar v. Staff Selection Commission & Anr.*', dismissing the O.A. filed by the petitioner herein.

2. The petitioner had filed the above O.A. before the learned Tribunal stating that he had participated in the recruitment process for the post of Junior Technical Assistant (Drilling), Post Code ER13822, in the Department of Geological Survey of India (Eastern Region),



Ministry of Mines, pursuant to the advertisement issued by the respondents on 12.05.2022. The result of the said examination was declared by the respondents on 18.11.2022, however, the name of the petitioner was not included therein. After a span of more than six months, the respondents declared an additional result on 29.05.2023 under Para 18.22 of the advertisement dated 12.05.2022, which permits the Commission to call additional candidates. In this additional list, the petitioner was also shortlisted and directed to submit his documents by 19.06.2023. The petitioner was unable to check the website, due to which he remained unaware of the additional result declared and could not upload his documents within time. He did not receive any separate intimation through SMS or email regarding the additional result being declared.

3. The respondents, *vide* notice dated 21.07.2023, rejected the candidature of the petitioner on the ground that he had failed to submit his documents.

4. The petitioner claimed that due to lack of adequate notice, only 15 candidates out of a total of 100 candidates, in fact, went on to submit their documents. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there are still 5 out of 11 vacancies available with the respondents for the above post.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in similar circumstances, the learned Tribunal, by its Order dated 02.08.2024 passed in O.A. 1076/2019, had allowed the O.A. filed by another candidate whose result had similarly been declared late, without intimation by SMS or email. The challenge against this order was



dismissed by this Court in its Judgment in **DSSSB & Anr. v. Mohan Lal Chhedwal**, 2024:DHC:9622-DB.

6. The learned counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, submits that as the petitioner had failed to submit his documents within the time granted, his candidature had been rightly rejected by the respondent. He submits that it was for the petitioner to keep himself informed about the declaration of the additional result on the website of the respondents.

7. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties.

8. In almost identical facts as those contended by the petitioner, this Court in **Mohan Lal Chhedwal** (supra) had observed as under:

“21. The nation is moving towards inclusivity. The stipulation that the candidates would be informed of their being shortlisted by SMS or email was obviously intended to ensure that candidates who were situated in areas which were remote or relatively inaccessible would also be made aware of the fact that they were shortlisted. The requirement of uploading the e-dossier within the time stipulated in that regard, as contained in the notice dated 18 February 2019, specifically applies to "shortlisted candidates". It obviously presupposes that the candidate was made aware of the fact that she, or he, had been shortlisted. A candidate who was never informed that he had been shortlisted, by the modes envisaged in the notice dated 18 February 2019, cannot, therefore, be bound down by the time stipulations regarding uploading of the e-dossier.



24. The cancellation of the respondent's candidature on the ground that he had not uploaded his e-dossier within time was, therefore, clearly illegal. The Tribunal was, consequently, justified in directing Petitioner 1 to accept the hard copy of the e-dossier of the respondent and appoint him as TGT if he qualified for such appointment as per his merit."

9. In the present case as well, the petitioner was not selected in the initial result. It is only in the additional result, declared after six months of the initial result, that the name of the petitioner was included as a successful candidate. In such circumstances it cannot be expected of a candidate to keep a track on the website of the respondent. It was incumbent on the respondents to have also informed the candidates of their selection and requirement of them to upload their e-dossiers by way of an email and SMS. Having not done so, the cancellation of the candidature of the petitioner cannot be sustained.

10. In view of the above, the Impugned Order passed by the learned Tribunal cannot be sustained. The same is accordingly set aside.

11. The petitioner is granted two weeks' time to submit the requisite documents to the respondents. Upon receipt of such documents, the respondents shall consider the candidature of the petitioner in accordance with the advertisement and the Rules applicable to the recruitment process. In case the petitioner is found to be meeting the merit, an offer of appointment shall be issued to the petitioner within a period of six weeks from today. The petitioner shall also be entitled to notional seniority along with his batchmates,



2025:DHC:10927-DB



however, he will not be entitled to any actual pay for the period he has not worked.

12. This petition is disposed of in the above terms.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

DECEMBER 2, 2025/prg/RM/VS