



2025:DHC:11018-DB



\$~54

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

Date of decision: 08.12.2025

+ **W.P.(C) 18551/2025
RAM CHANDRA**

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms.Suroor Mander, Mr.Gaurav
Kumar, Mr.Kumar Nikhil
Mr.Kartik Rajpurohit, Mr.Sumit
Kumar Gupta, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Abhishek Mahajan, SPC
with Mr.Arvind, GP.

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

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPL. 77074/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CM APPL. 77073/2025

2. This application seeks permission to file lengthy synopsis and list of dates.

3. Having considered the contents of the application, the same is allowed.

W.P.(C) 18551/2025

4. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated



06.12.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. 3809/2016, titled ***Ram Chandra v. Union of India & Ors.***, whereby the learned Tribunal dismissed the said O.A. filed by the petitioner herein on the ground that it was barred by the principle of *re-judicata*.

5. To give a brief background of facts in which the present petition arise, the petitioner had participated in the selection process for the post of Trainee Fireman 'A'/Diesel Assistant/Electric Assistant published by the respondents on 12.05.1990. Though he qualified the written examination and the subsequent *viva-voce*, however, he was not given the appointment. He filed the first O.A. before the learned Tribunal being O.A. No.689/1993, challenging the order dated 16.11.1992 passed by the respondents informing him that his certificate for the technical course cannot be accepted. The said O.A. filed by the petitioner was dismissed by the learned Tribunal *vide* its Order dated 23.12.1997, aggrieved of which, the petitioner filed a writ petition being C.W.P. 1040/1998 before this Court. The same was also dismissed by this Court *vide* its judgment dated 03.03.1998.

6. The petitioner then filed the second O.A., being O.A. No.2653/2003, before the learned Tribunal claiming that the respondents had not disclosed the complete facts in the earlier O.A.. The same was dismissed by the learned Tribunal *vide* its Order dated 10.02.2006, finding the same to be barred by the principle of *res-judicata*.

7. Still not satisfied, the petitioner then approached the National



Commission for Scheduled Caste, wherein certain directions were issued by the Commission. This then led to filing of another O.A. by the petitioner, being O.A. 330/00170/2016, before the Allahabad Bench of the learned Tribunal, which was withdrawn with liberty to file O.A. afresh.

8. The petitioner then filed the O.A. 3809/2016 before the learned Tribunal. The same, as noted hereinabove, had been dismissed on the ground of *res-judicata*.

9. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been running from pillar to post for getting justice. She submits that the petitioner has been wrongly denied appointment to the post, while another person namely Mr.Sanjay Kumar, was given such appointment.

10. We are unable to accept the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner.

11. From the above narration of facts itself, it would be apparent that the petitioner is re-agitating the same issue by filing one after another O.As. The petitioner cannot be allowed to challenge his non-selection by raising new grounds with each new O.A. filed by him. The learned Tribunal has, in fact, noted that in normal circumstance, it would have imposed costs on the petitioner for misusing the process of law in such manner. We find no infirmity in the order passed by the learned Tribunal. In fact, we would also have done the same but we are letting the petitioner go at this instance. We may herein observe that old settled issues cannot be kept on being re-agitated in form of fresh O.As. We hope that the petitioner this time understands this and



2025:DHC:11018-DB



the implication thereof.

12. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

DECEMBER 8, 2025/Arya/VS

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: REYMON VASHIST
Signing Date: 11.12.2025
18:53:54

WP(C) 18551/2025

Page 4 of 4