



\$~69

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

+ LPA 111/2026 & CM APPL. 14724/2026

RUCHIKA TANWAR

.....Appellant

Through: Mr.Shivanshu Bhardwaj and
Mr.Himanshu Bhardwaj, Advs.

versus

**THE REGISTRAR, GURU GOBIND SINGH INDRAPRASTHA
UNIVERSITY AND ORS**Respondents

Through: Ms.Anita Sahani, Adv for R-1.
Mr.Abhishek Gupta, CGSC with
Mr.Kushagra Sachdeva, GP,
Mr.Dhananjay Singh, Mr.Kumar
Kartikaya and Mr.Chanulaya Kene,
Advs for UoI.
Mr.Balendu Shekhar, Mr.Rajkumar
Maurya, Mr.Krishna Chaitanya and
Mr.Divyansh Singh Dev, Adv for R-
3 & 4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

11.03.2026

%

1. Heard learned counsel for the appellant-petitioner.
2. This Letters Patent Appeal challenges the order dated 14.01.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge whereby, W.P.(C) 7692/2017 filed by the appellant-petitioner has been dismissed.
3. Learned counsel for the appellant-petitioner has contended that the writ petition filed by the appellant-petitioner has been dismissed on a wrong premise, for the reason that the impugned order is based on another



judgment of the learned Single Judge passed in *W.P.(C) 2943/2013*, titled as ***Dr. Debasis Poddar & Ors. v. Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University and Anr.***, and since the facts of the said case were different and, therefore, any judgment rendered in the said writ petition would not govern the case of the appellant-petitioner. It has also been argued by the learned counsel for the appellant-petitioner that the reservation for the posts in question was wrongly applied and in fact, the application of reservation was against the roster points as contained in the Office Memorandum dated 15.07.2008.

4. It has further been argued that as a matter of fact, the appellant-petitioner was the sole candidate belonging to the Other Backward Class (OBC) category, who appeared in the interview and she too was not selected from the said category, which vitiates the impugned selection.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the appellant-petitioner and perused the records available before us on this Letters Patent Appeal, we are not convinced with the submissions made on behalf of the appellant-petitioner for the following reasons:

(a) Prior to instituting *W.P.(C) 7692/2017*, the appellant-petitioner had instituted *W.P.(C) 5070/2014*, for redressal of the same grievances, which was disposed of in terms of the submissions made by the learned counsel representing the respondent-University to the effect that reply to the legal notice dated 08.01.2014 shall be given.

The said order was passed by the learned Single Judge on 12.08.2014, pursuant to which, the legal notice served by the appellant-petitioner, was replied with on 30.09.2014, which is on record as *Annexure P-9* to this appeal.



A perusal of the reply given to the legal notice clearly reveals that the appellant-petitioner was considered for appointment against the post reserved for OBC Category, however, in the interview conducted for the said purpose, she was not found suitable.

Thus, the reason of non-selection of the appellant-petitioner is that though, she was considered for selection against the post reserved for OBC Category candidates, however, on the basis of interview she was not found suitable.

Once a candidate has not been found suitable by the Selection Committee which comprises of experts, it is very difficult for the Court to judicially review any such decision in relation to suitability of a candidate for appointment taken by the Selection Committee comprising of experts.

(b) We also note that the selection in question was initiated *vide* advertisement issued on 24.01.2013. The appointments pursuant to the selection held in terms of the said advertisement was made way back in the year 2013 and, therefore, any interference at this juncture in the selections already held which have also been given effect to, in our opinion would not be warranted.

6. We find that learned Single Judge, while relying upon the judgment in ***Dr. Debasis Poddar (supra)*** has dismissed the writ petition. It is also to be noticed that one of the grounds taken by the learned Single Judge, for not exercising the discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India was that in a situation where selections had already taken place and appointments had also been given, interference to the recruitment process would not be warranted.

7. For the aforesaid reasons, in our opinion, the appellant-petitioner has



not been able to make out any good ground to interfere in the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge.

8. The present appeal along with pending application is, therefore, dismissed.

9. There will be no order as to costs.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TEJAS KARIA, J

MARCH 11, 2026/MJ