



\$~88

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6439/2026**

**VASUDEV KAPOOR**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shailendra Bhardwaj and Ms.  
Aroma S. Bhardwaj, Advocates.

versus

**UNION PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

.....Respondent

Through:

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

**ORDER**

**12.05.2026**

%

1. The Petitioner is a civil services aspirant, who appeared in Civil Services Examination (CSE) Preliminary 2024 conducted by the Union Public Service Commission<sup>1</sup>. He has raised grievances regarding the manner in which the said examination was evaluated and seeks reliefs to the following effect:

*“(i) issue an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction thereby directing the respondent to grant him an extra compensatory attempt for UPSC Civil Services Examination (CSE) as a one-time relief measure while not counting the attempt for CSE 2024 on account of the respondent UPSC committing an error in assessing the question in General Studies Paper-I in Civil Services (Preliminary) Examination, 2024 conducted by the respondent UPSC; and*

*(ii) Direct the respondent to count CSE 2024 in respect of petitioner's final result for service allocation and seniority due to deprivation of appearing in the Mains Examination of Civil Services Examination 2024, resulting in disaster instead of potential decider attempt;”*

---

<sup>1</sup> “UPSC”



2. At the outset, counsel for the Respondents raise an objection as to the maintainability of the present petition, contending that UPSC is a notified authority under Section 14 of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985 and the dispute raised herein falls within the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal (“CAT”). It is submitted that, in view of the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***L. Chandra Kumar vs Union of India & Ors.***,<sup>2</sup> the Petitioner, having an efficacious alternative remedy before the CAT, cannot invoke the writ jurisdiction of this Court.

3. In view of the above objection, counsel for the Petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the present petition with liberty to avail appropriate remedies before the CAT. He, however, submits that the Petitioner has already submitted a representation dated 13<sup>th</sup> April, 2026 to the Respondent-UPSC, which remains pending consideration. It is contended that should the Respondent-UPSC, upon consideration of the said representation, having regard to the order dated 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 2026 passed by the Gujarat High Court in *R/Special Civil Application No. 12450/2025*, redress the Petitioner’s grievance, further proceedings before the CAT may not even be necessitated. Accordingly, a limited request is made that the said representation be directed to be decided expeditiously.

4. Leave and liberty as prayed for, are granted. This Court finds merit in the limited submission advanced on behalf of the Petitioner that consideration of the pending representation at the first instance may obviate the necessity of further litigation. Accordingly, the Respondent-UPSC is directed to consider and decide the Petitioner’s representation dated 13<sup>th</sup>



April, 2026 within a period of four weeks from today. In the event the decision taken is adverse to the Petitioner, it shall be open to him to avail remedies in accordance with law before the CAT, in terms of the decision of the Supreme Court in *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India*.

5. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of.

**SANJEEV NARULA, J**

**MAY 12, 2026**

*nk*

---

<sup>2</sup> AIR 1997 SC 1125