



2025:DHC:10122-DB



\$~63

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**+ **W.P.(C) 17370/2025 & CM APPL. 71710/2025****MONU**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vivek Sheel, Ms.
Deepshikha, Mr. Anshul Mahajan, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Honey Khanna, SPC and
Mr. Gaurav Khosla, GP for UOI with Mr.
Devender Singh, DC JAG**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA****JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

%

17.11.2025**C.HARI SHANKAR, J.**

1. A classic case, we may say, of much ado about nothing.
2. The petitioner is a youth belonging to a humble rural background who desires to serve in the Indo Tibetan Border Police¹. Consequent to Advertisement 11/2024, the petitioner applied for recruitment to the post of Constable (Driver). That he is qualified for the said post is not in dispute. The admit cards for the examination were issued nearly a year after the application on 3 November 2025.
3. At that time, the petitioner came to know that his application was rejected with the note – “*Name is incorrect. Kindly re-submit application form within 03 days from today.*” This communication,



2025:DHC:10122-DB



according to the petitioner, was never received by him.

4. Given the nature of the dispute in this case, we do not deem it necessary to burden this order with any detailed allusion of facts.

5. The petitioner's name is Monu. He has no surname. The admission form, however, required a name and a surname to be filled. Both the columns have the name Monu filled in them. According to the petitioner, this was an automated result of the fact that the petitioner's name was Monu and that he did not have a surname.

6. In any case, there is no dispute about the fact that the petitioner's name is Monu. We do not think that the time of this Court should be taken up by keeping the writ petition pending.

7. The respondents' contention initially was that the petitioner had been intimated that there was a discrepancy in his name almost a year ago and the petitioner was directed to clear the discrepancy within three days but he did not do so.

8. Mr. Vivek Sheel, learned Counsel for the petitioner, on instructions submits that this communication never reached his client.

9. In any case, the fact of the matter is that the admit card was issued almost a year after the advertisement.

10. The issue is trivial. Mr. Honey Khanna, learned SPC, on instructions, very fairly agrees that this petition need not be kept



2025:DHC:10122-DB



pending, burdening the docket of this Court.

11. We direct that the fact that the name Monu is entered in the name as well as surname in the concerned columns of the petitioner's application form should not be treated as a ground for disqualifying him from participating in the selection process.

12. Subject to his satisfying all other requirements, the petitioner would be allowed to participate in the selection process.

13. Accordingly, we dispose of this writ petition in the above terms.

14. This order is being passed in the peculiar facts of this case and would not be treated as a precedent.

15. Let a copy of this order be given *dasti* to learned Counsel for the parties under signature of the Court Master.

16. Learned Counsel for the respondents also agrees to inform the authorities that the petitioner should be permitted to appear in the exam.

C.HARI SHANKAR, J

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

NOVEMBER 17, 2025/rjd