



\$~46

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

+ W.P.(C) 2633/2026 and CM APPL. 12790/2026

BIMLA DEVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manish Rohilla, Mr.
Pradeep Yadav, Mr. Abhishek
Singh, Mr. Aman Singh, Advs.
with Petitioner in-person.

versus

DELHI SUBORDINATE SERVICES SELECTION BOARD
THROUGH ITS SECRETARY & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Avnish Ahlawat, SC with
Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms.
Aliza Alam, Mr. Mohnish
Sehrawat, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

25.02.2026

%

1. Through the present Petition, the Petitioner assails the correctness of the order dated 06.11.2025 [hereinafter referred to as 'Impugned Order'] passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi [hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'], whereby the Miscellaneous Application ('MA') bearing No.4743/2025, filed by the Petitioner seeking restoration of her Original Application ('OA') No.1191/2015, was dismissed.
2. Though the Tribunal has dismissed the aforestated MA, notwithstanding the same, this Court has heard the learned counsel representing the Petitioner on the merits of the OA. It is pertinent to note that the MA seeking restoration of the OA, came to be filed after a period of six years.
3. Be that as it may, in order to comprehend the issues involved in



the present case, the relevant facts in brief are required to be noticed.

4. Pursuant to Recruitment Notice dated 07.11.2003, the Petitioner applied for the post of TGT (Hindi)(Female) under the OBC category and duly participated in the written examination held on 29.02.2004. Upon evaluation, she secured 46.50 marks. The result of the said recruitment process was declared on 04.06.2004, wherein the Petitioner was not found successful. It is an admitted position that the Petitioner was fully aware of her non-selection as far back as the year 2004.

5. Thus, the cause of action, if any, stood crystallized on the date of the declaration of the result. However, it was only in the year 2015 that she approached the Tribunal, by way of an OA seeking appointment under the very said Notice. In such circumstances, the OA was ex-facie barred by limitation.

6. In the interregnum, pursuant to a subsequent and independent selection process, the Petitioner was duly selected and appointed in the year 2008, thereby joining the service without demur. Thereafter, in the year 2015, the Petitioner sought to reopen the chapter of the earlier selection process of 2003–2004 by instituting an OA claiming appointment thereunder. The said OA, did not culminate in adjudication on merits and came to be dismissed for non-prosecution in the year 2019.

7. In the year 2023, the Petitioner resorted to file a fresh OA, however, the same was dismissed on the ground of limitation. Undeterred, the Petitioner invoked the writ jurisdiction of the High Court, assailing the order of the Tribunal. The Writ Petition met the same fate and was dismissed. The matter was carried further to the Supreme Court by way of Special Leave Petition, which too was



dismissed, thereby lending quietus and finality to the controversy.

8. Yet, in a further attempt to unsettle what had already been conclusively settled, the Petitioner filed MA seeking restoration of the earlier OA that had been dismissed for non-prosecution in 2019. The procedural history thus discloses a pattern of repeated invocations of jurisdiction in respect of a cause that stood extinguished by efflux of time and confirmed by successive judicial pronouncements.

9. This Court has considered the entire conspectus of facts, examined the matter from every conceivable angle and perused the record. Upon such comprehensive evaluation, it emerges unambiguously that the Petitioner, having been duly selected and appointed pursuant to the subsequent recruitment process of the year 2008, entered service and in the ordinary course of time, stood superannuated on 30.04.2023.

10. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, this Court does not find any reason to interfere with the Impugned Order.

11. The present Petition is accordingly dismissed with costs in the sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) payable by the Petitioner directly to the “*Poor Patients Fund under the aegis of AIIMS, New Delhi*”. The proof of payment shall be filed within two weeks.

12. The pending application also stands closed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

FEBRUARY 25, 2026

jai/hr