



\$~72

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 2302/2026, CM APPL. 11068/2026 and CM APPL. 11069/2026
MANGI TEJESWARA RAOPetitioner
Through: Mr. R. Sathish, Adv.
versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr.Adv.[Appearance not given]

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER
18.02.2026

%

1. By way of the present Petition, the Petitioner seeks issuance of a Writ in the nature of *Certiorari* to quash the impugned Order dated 30.10.2025 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi [hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'], whereby his Original Application (OA) came to be dismissed.
2. In substance, the Petitioner aspires to be selected as a Primary Teacher, pursuant to Advertisement No.166/2016 dated 10.09.2016 issued by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT)/Respondent No.2. It is the claim of the Petitioner that he belongs to the Other Backward Classes (OBC) category and that 09 posts with respect to the said category were notified for the above-mentioned position. The selection process was based upon the combined performance of the candidates in the written examination followed by an interview, with a weightage in the ratio of 85:15.



3. Subsequently, the written examination was conducted, results of which were declared on 21.01.2019 and 22.05.2019. However, it was the case of the Petitioner before the Tribunal that, despite repeated representations made by him, the Respondent No.2 failed to consider and address his objections regarding the correctness of certain questions in the said examination. According to the Petitioner, it was only on 17.08.2020 that the aforesaid factum came to be acknowledged, thereby revising his marks in the written examination.

4 It is pertinent to note that the Petitioner was initially awarded 75 marks in the written examination. Thereafter, he appeared in the interview held on 18.07.2019, wherein he secured 25 marks. Consequently, his aggregate marks stood at 100, pursuant to which he was placed on the waiting list.

5. Thereafter, the result of the written examination was revised, consequently, the Petitioner secured 82 marks. Upon grant of the benefit of the revised score, he was placed in the revised waiting list.

6. The Tribunal has culled out the following comparative chart to elucidate the exact factual position:

Written and Interview Marks

Candidate name	Written Marks (120)	Written Marks Weightage (85%)	Interview Marks (60)	Interview Marks Weightage (15%)	Merit-written +Interview (100)	Remarks
Ms. Neha Singh	77	54.54	55	13.75	68.29	Selected - 5
Sh. Tejaswara Rao Mangi	75	53.13	25	6.25	59.38	Wait List - 10



After Revised Written Marks

Candidate name	Written Marks (120)	Written Marks Weightage (85%)	Interview Marks (60)	Interview Marks Weightage (15%)	Merit-written + Interview (100)	Remarks
Ms. Neha Singh	80	56.66	55	13.75	70.41	Selected
Sh. Tejaswara Rao Mangi	82	58.08	25	6.25	64.33	Wait List

7. Keeping in view, the aforesaid position, the O.A. filed by the Petitioner came to be dismissed.

8. Heard learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the paper book.

9. At the outset, it may be noticed that the original result was declared on 21.01.2019, whereas the revised result was declared on 17.11.2020. However, the Petitioner filed the O.A. on 06.09.2022, i.e., after a delay of approximately 02 years from the declaration of the revised result. The matter is now being considered in the year 2026.

10. Learned counsel representing the Petitioner contends that the revised result of the written examination ought to have been declared prior to the conduct of the interview, as the delay allegedly affected the performance of the Petitioner in the interview.

11. This Court has considered the aforesaid submissions made by the learned counsel.

12. We are of the view that the marks awarded in the interview were independent of the marks obtained in the written examination. Admittedly, upon revision of the marks of the written examination, due benefit has been extended to the Petitioner, in as much as his marks in the written examination has been reckoned as 82 instead of



75. Furthermore, we have also been apprised by the learned counsel representing the Respondent that no candidate with lesser marks than the Petitioner in the OBC category has been appointed to the post of Primary Teacher.

13. Keeping in view the aforesaid position, no ground for interference is made out. Accordingly, the present Petition, along with pending application, stands dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

FEBRUARY 18, 2026

s.godara/hr