



\$~80

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6362/2026 & CM APPL. 31256-31257/2026**

RAVINDER KUMAR YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vinod Kataria, Mr. Ajay Kataria
and Mr. B. P. Vaishnav, Advocates.

versus

**TRANSLATION HEALTH SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
INSTITUTE AND ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Prema Priyadarshini and Mr.
Priyansh Kanwar, Advocates for R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

11.05.2026

%

1. The Petitioner applied for the post of Data Entry Operator [“DEO”] advertised under a recruitment notice issued by Translational Health Science and Technology Institute [“THSTI”]. He was not selected and hence his grievance. Once the final selection list was published and the Petitioner did not find his name reflected therein, he submitted a representation dated 02nd May, 2026 expressing his disappointment regarding exclusion from the final merit list. The representation proceeds on the premise that such exclusion is erroneous and unjust, especially considering his relevant service experience. Additionally, the Petitioner seeks a writ of *certiorari* quashing the appointment of Respondent No. 5 to the said post.

2. On a specific query from this Court as to the foundation for approaching the Court, counsel for the Petitioner submits that since no



reasons for the Petitioner's non-selection have been communicated to him, he presently has no substantive basis to support his challenge except the assertion that he fulfils the requisite qualifications and, therefore, there was no reason for his exclusion from selection.

3. On a further query as to the basis for challenging the appointment of Respondent No. 5, counsel submits that it is the Petitioner's understanding that Respondent No. 5 does not fulfil the requisite experience criteria stipulated in the recruitment notification.

4. Neither of the aforesaid premises, in the opinion of this Court, is sufficient at this stage to warrant interference in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. At the same time, considering that the Petitioner's representation dated 02nd May, 2026 (erroneously mentioned therein as 02nd May, 2025) remains undecided, THSTI is directed to consider and dispose of the same by passing a reasoned and speaking decision thereon indicating the basis for the Petitioner's non-selection, within a period of two weeks from today.

5. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms. The Court has not commented on the merits of the case, and all rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MAY 11, 2026/hc