



\$~86

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1892/2025**

SHRUTI VYAS & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Bharat Gupta, Ms. Shruti Jain, Ms. Sansriti Trivedi and Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocates.

versus

**LIEUTENANT GENERAL VPS KAUSHIK,
ADJUTANT GENERAL**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain, CGSC with Mr. Rudra Paliwal, GP with Mr. Kautilya Birat, Mr. Ankush Kapoor and Mr. Vishwadeep, Advocates with Major Anish Muralidhar, Army.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

%

10.12.2025

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition under Article 215 of the Constitution of India read with Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, seeks the following prayers:-

“(a) Take cognizance of and initiate proceedings for contempt against the Respondent / Alleged Contemnor for noncompliance with this Hon’ble Court’s judgment and order dated 16.09.2025 in WP(C) No. 1106/2024;

(b) Direct the Respondent / Alleged Contemnor to issue the necessary joining instructions to the Petitioners for the next Short Service Commission Women (Non-Technical) training course, scheduled to commence around February 2026 / March 2026;

(c) award costs of the present Petition to the Petitioners; and/or



(d) pass such other or further order(s) as it may deem fit.”

3. Learned Division Bench of this Court *vide* judgment dated 16.09.2025 passed in W.P.(C) 1106/2024, had passed the following directions:-

“Conclusion

10. We, therefore, direct that the petitioners be considered against the 62 unfilled vacancies of men, as there could have been no limitation on the number of women who could be entitled to recruitment against the corps and services identified in para 45 of Arshnoor Kaur. Needless to say, however, the petitioners would not be entitled for induction into any other corps or services, other than the corps or services, which are identified in para 45 of the decision in Arshnoor Kaur.

11. A closing caveat

11.1 Maj. Anish Muralidhar, who ably assisted the learned ASG and Mr. Swain and has, we must acknowledge, been of considerable assistance to us in ensuring dispensation of justice in the present roster, points out that the actual identification of the streams to which the candidates would be deployed or posted takes place only after training. As such, it is submitted that, before training commences, it is not possible to identify as to whether the petitioners would in fact be suitable for deployment against one of the ten corps or service identified in para 45 of Arshnoor Kaur.

11.2 Though we feel that this is an aspect which should have been taken up before the Supreme Court when it rendered Arshnoor Kaur, Mr. Indra Sen Singh also agrees that the right of the petitioners for deployment would only be against one or more of the ten categories of corps and services notified under Section 12 of the Army Act and identified in para 45 of Arshnoor Kaur.

11.3 We, therefore, clarify that the entitlement of the petitioners to appointment and deployment against the remaining 62 unfilled vacancies of men would be conditional upon their being found suitable for deployment against one or more of the identified corps and services identified in para 45 of the decision in Arshnoor Kaur.

12. As one of the issues that may arise is regarding the petitioners



satisfying the age requirement for the post, we clarify that the benefits of this judgment would be available to those petitioners who were within the prescribed age on the date of declaration of the result.

13. If there are any pre-training formalities such as medical clearance, which are required to be fulfilled, it goes without saying that the petitioners would be required to fulfil them, before undergoing training.

14. Needless to say, should the petitioners qualify and be selected, they would be entitled to all other consequential reliefs as available in law.

15. The petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms.”

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent, on instructions from Major Anish Muralidhar, submits that a communication dated 10.12.2025 had been sent to counsel for the petitioners, with regard to the petitioners, *i.e.*, Ms. Shruti Vyas, Ms. Aishani Chand and Ms. Alisha Saini, wherein it has been recorded as under:-

“1.Refer your Notice dated 07 Dec 2025 with respect to implementation of Hon'ble Delhi High Court order dated 16 Sep 2025 in the above mentioned writ petition.

2.The judgment was passed by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on 16 Sep 2025 and since the induction process of SSCW(Non Tech)-36 course had commenced, candidates could not be inducted in SSCW(Non Tech)-36 course. The petitioners shall be considered for induction in the next course *i.e.* SSCW(Non Tech)-37 scheduled to commence in Apr 2026, as per directions of the Hon ble Court”

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners confirms the aforesaid.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent, on instructions from Major Anish Muralidhar, submits that the petitioners shall be considered for induction in the next course, in terms of the aforesaid communication, subject to the directions given by learned Division Bench.



7. In view of the above, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners does not wish to press the present petition.
8. The present petition is disposed of as not pressed, with liberty to the petitioners to take appropriate steps as available in law in case of non-compliance.
9. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

DECEMBER 10, 2025/sn/db