



\$~28

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

+ **W.P.(C) 3734/2022**

SUNIL KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gaurav Sarawat & Mr. U.
Srivastava, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Archana Gaur CGSC, Ms.
Ridhima Gaur, Mr. Deepu
Kumar, Advs. for UOI.
Ms. Archana Gaur, Adv., Mr.
Vikas Chaurasia- CLA/NRHQ,
Mr. Ravi- Clerk/RRC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **11.02.2026**

1. Through the present writ petition, *inter alia*, the Petitioner seeks to challenge order dated 19.02.2020 (hereafter '**impugned order**'), passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal in OA No. 2364/2015.

2. Briefly stated, the candidature of the Petitioner was rejected on the ground that there was mismatch in the handwriting on the Application Form, OMR and document verification papers. The Petitioner's Original Application against the cancellation of his candidature, that is, OA No. 2364/2015, was dismissed by the impugned order.

3. On 01.11.2022, the following order was passed by this Court:



“1. Original record has been produced. Perusal of the original record prima facie shows that handwriting on the OMR sheet as well as application form is of the same individual though there is an opinion annexed which states that handwriting does not match.

2. Prima facie, we are not in agreement with the opinion. It is, however, observed that the application form as well as OMR sheet, both contain thumb impression. There is no forensic opinion with regard to the thumb impression.

3. Accordingly, it is directed that OMR sheet as well as application form be sent to the Central Forensic Science Laboratory, Rohini for rendering an opinion on the thumb impression as well as the handwriting and signatures of the applicants contained therein.

4. Respondents are accordingly directed to send the same to the CFSL for rendering an opinion. Director, CFSL is requested to expedite the examination and submit a report to the Court, before the next date of hearing.

5. List on 23.01.2023.”

4. In compliance with the aforesaid direction, Fingerprint Examination Report dated 21.01.2026 has been produced. As per the result of examination, it has been found that the Questioned Thumb Impression marked as Q-3 (thumb print on the Petitioner’s application form) is different from Questioned Thumb Impression marked as Q-6 (thumb print on the Petitioner’s answer sheet). The relevant portion of the report is as under:

“3. Questioned Thumb Impression marked as Q-3 is “DIFFERENT” from Questioned Thumb Impression marked as Q-6 and also “DIFFERENT” from any of the Specimen Left Hand Thumb Impression of the candidate named- Sunil Kumar, Roll No.20037322 marked on sheets S-21 to S-24 respectively.”

5. Keeping in view the aforesaid opinion, this Court is left with no choice but to dismiss the Writ Petition.



6. The present Writ Petition is dismissed in the aforesaid terms.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

FEBRUARY 11, 2026
“SK”