



\$~80

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2898/2026 & CM APPL. 14039/2026**

GAURAV DUTT SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. V. K. Sharma, Advocate.**

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: **Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC, GNCTD
with Mr. N. K. Singh, Ms. Aliza
Alam and Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat,
Advocates for R-1 and R-3.**

**Mr. Nirvikar Verma, Mr. O. P. Verma
and Ms. Bhoomika Verma, Advocates
for R-2/ Delhi Jal Board.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

09.03.2026

%

1. This petition filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India seeks directions to the Respondents to conduct an enquiry prior to holding the Departmental Promotion Examination for the post of Junior Engineer (Civil/Electrical & Mechanical Maintenance) pursuant to a Circular dated 10th March, 2025. The Petitioner also seeks a direction to Respondents No. 1 to 3 to dispose of representations dated 2nd February, 2026 and 11th February, 2026 raising grievances regarding the eligibility of certain candidates allegedly possessing qualifications from institutions not recognised by the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE).
2. Although the relief is framed as one for consideration of the aforesaid



representations, the substance of the challenge is to the conduct of the departmental promotion process itself and, more particularly, to the eligibility of certain candidates proposed to be permitted to participate in that process.

3. The Court would not issue mandamus at the behest of a person who asserts no enforceable legal right of his own. In matters concerning recruitment, promotion, or *inter se* eligibility within a service, the challenge must ordinarily come from a person participating in, or directly affected by, the process. The Petitioner, however, does not claim to be an employee of the respondent organisation, much less a candidate in the departmental promotion exercise.

4. On a specific query from the Court, counsel for the Petitioner fairly states that the Petitioner has no service nexus with the respondents and has approached the Court only as a “citizen of India”. However, the matter also cannot be recast as one in public interest. Such a generalised assertion does not furnish the locus required to maintain a challenge to an internal promotional process. Moreover, the petition concerns the eligibility of certain individual candidates to participate in a departmental promotion examination, which is a service dispute of a confined and private character. No larger public law issue affecting the community at large is disclosed. Nor are there foundational pleadings to justify invocation of the Court’s writ jurisdiction in the nature of a public interest proceeding. A stranger to the service cannot be permitted to question an internal promotional exercise merely on the basis of a self-assumed concern for institutional propriety. In the absence of any direct legal injury, any statutory footing, or any demonstrable public interest element, the petition is plainly not



maintainable.

5. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed as not maintainable.
Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MARCH 9, 2026/hc