



\$~100

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 524/2025
AYODHYA KUMAR RAJBHARPetitioner
Through: Appearance not given.

versus

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Pramod Gupta and Mr. Umang
Dixit, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER
% **16.01.2025**
CM APPL. 2438/2025 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 524/2025

1. The petitioner has approached this Court for a direction upon the respondent- Lok Sabha Secretariat to appoint/engage the petitioner as a casual labour.
2. The contention of the petitioner is that he applied for such engagement as an Other Backward Classes ["OBC"] category candidate in the year 2017. He was called for interview and secured 23 marks out of a maximum of 25 marks, but was not engaged. The petitioner thereafter applied under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ["RTI Act"], on 12.03.2024, seeking information with regard to the aforesaid recruitment. By their reply dated 12.03.2024, the respondents have informed the petitioner that he was found ineligible for the final stage screening of candidates held



on 15.04.2017-16.04.2017, as he had not supplied the caste/category certificate in the prescribed format and the certificate enclosed with his form was issued prior to 01.10.2013.

3. Without getting into the merits of the petitioner's contentions, I am of the view that it is inappropriate to entertain this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution at this belated stage. The recruitment in question was held in 2017. The petitioner participated in the first-stage screening on 17.01.2017 but was found ineligible for the final stage screening held in April, 2017. In the list of dates and writ petition, there is no averment with regard to any steps taken by him in this regard from 2017 until he submitted an application under the RTI Act in the year 2024.

4. In the meanwhile, it is stated in the writ petition itself that the final result for engagement of casual labours was declared on 23.05.2017.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Ram Kumar Gijroya v. Delhi Subordinate Services Board & Another*, [(2016) 4 SCC 754]. However, the said judgment holds that reserved category candidates ought to be permitted to submit their certificates before publication of the provisional selection list. It does not address the question of delay in filing of a writ petition.

6. In view of the inordinate delay in approaching this Court, I am unable to come to the aid of the petitioner in the present petition.

7. The petition is, therefore, dismissed.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JANUARY 16, 2025/MR/kb/