



\$~61

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

+ W.P.(C) 5115/2026, CM APPL. 25086-25088/2026

BIKASH KUMAR MAHTO AND ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Saurabh Agrawal, Mr. Ashutosh
Singh Rana, Advocates.

versus

DEDICATED FREIGHT CORRIDOR CORPORATION OF INDIA
LTD.Respondent

Through: Mr. V.S.R. Krishna, Mr. Shashank
Kumar, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
17.04.2026

%

1. The Petitioners are working as Junior Project Managers [“JPM”] in Grade E-2 with Dedicated Freight Corridor Corporation of India Limited [“DFCCIL”], a Government of India enterprise under the Ministry of Railways.
2. The Petitioners assert that they are experienced officers who have consistently maintained good service records and APAR gradings, and are fully eligible for consideration for promotion to Grade E-3.
3. As per Rule 8.7.1(a)(ii) of the applicable promotion rules dated 21st October, 2020, intra-cluster promotion is to be carried out on the basis of interview, wherein 50% of the marks are allocated on the basis of APARs and 50% on the basis of interview. In order to be promoted, an employee must secure 60% marks in both components. It is contended that the



Petitioners satisfy the said benchmark on the basis of their APARs.

4. The grievance of the Petitioners arises from the promotion process culminating in Office Order dated 2nd March, 2026, whereby they have been declared unsuccessful. It is alleged that the interview process was conducted in an arbitrary and pre-determined manner. Emphasis is placed on the manner in which the interviews were conducted, including the limited time afforded to the Petitioners, approximately five minutes, *vis-à-vis* significantly longer durations granted to other candidates. It is further contended that such disparity deprived the Petitioners of a fair opportunity to present their candidature. Additionally, it is urged that there was lack of transparency in the process, including non-disclosure of marks and evaluation criteria.

5. In these circumstances, the Petitioners submitted a representation dated 3rd March, 2026, requesting reconsideration of the interview results for the concerned cluster and seeking examination of the video recordings of the interviews to assess whether the process was fair, objective and unbiased.

6. At this stage, in the absence of a Counter Affidavit, this Court is not inclined to adjudicate on the merits of the allegations raised by the Petitioners. Nonetheless, considering that the aforesaid representation is pending and the issues raised involve factual aspects relating to the conduct of the interview process, this Court deems it appropriate to direct the competent authority to decide the same. For the purpose of such consideration, the competent authority may, if necessary, examine the video recordings of the interviews and any other relevant material so as to ensure a fair and objective determination. The said exercise shall be completed within a period of four weeks from today, and a reasoned decision shall be



communicated to the Petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of along with the pending applications.

8. It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case. In the event the Petitioners remain aggrieved, they shall be at liberty to avail appropriate remedies in accordance with law.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

APRIL 17, 2026/ab