



\$~70

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

+ W.P.(C) 2319/2026, CM APPLs. 11224/2026, 11225/2026,
11226/2026 & 11227/2026

RAM PARIKSHEET KUMAR & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Aslam Ahmed Jamal, Ms.
Shabiesta Nabi and Ms. Ankita
Sharma, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Shashank Bajpai, CGSC with Ms.
Aashna Mehra, Mr. Vatsal Tripathi,
Mr. Govind Singh Chauhan and Mr.
Adhiraj Singh, Advs. for R-1 to R-3
Mr. Ravinder Agarwal, Mr. Manish
Kumar Singh and Mr. Vasu Agarwal,
Advs. for R-4
Ms. Pearl Sharma, Advs. for R-6

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
18.02.2026

%

1. This petition challenges the rejection of the Petitioners' candidature for the post of Airworthiness Officer¹ in the Directorate General of Civil Aviation,² pursuant to Advertisement No. 12/2023 dated 24th June, 2023 issued by the Union Public Service Commission,³ culminating in rejection orders dated 12th December, 2025.

¹ "AWO"

² "DGCA"

³ "UPSC"



2. Some of the Petitioners had earlier approached the Central Administrative Tribunal,⁴ Principal Bench, New Delhi, by filing O.A. No. 3593/2024. The said O.A. was disposed of by order dated 3rd July, 2025, directing the respondents to consider their candidature and issue appointment if otherwise eligible. Subsequent thereto, the Respondents passed the impugned rejection orders dated 12th December, 2025, which are under challenge in the present proceedings.

3. At the outset, counsel for the Respondents raises a preliminary objection to the maintainability of the present petition on the ground that the dispute pertains to recruitment to a civil post under the Union and squarely falls within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal under Section 14 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. It is submitted that the UPSC is covered under the said Act and, in view of the law laid down by the Supreme Court in *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India*⁵, the Tribunal is the court of first instance in such service matters.

4. Since the Petitioners have an efficacious alternative remedy before the Tribunal, they cannot directly invoke the writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

5. In view of the aforementioned preliminary objection, counsel for the Petitioners seeks leave to withdraw the present petition with liberty to approach the Tribunal in accordance with law.

6. Leave and liberty as prayed for, are granted.

7. It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the controversy. All rights and contentions of the parties are kept

⁴ “the Tribunal”

⁵ 1997 (2) SCR 1186



open.

8. The petition is disposed of along with pending applications.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

FEBRUARY 18, 2026/rr