



\$~7

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ W.P.(C) 5895/2020, CM APPL. 21310/2020, CM APPL. 21313/2020 and CM APPL. 43484/2021

INDU RAWAT

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Avnish Ahlawat, Standing Counsel with Ms. Laavanya Kaushik and Ms. Aliza Alam, Advs.

versus

DELHI URBAN ART COMMISSION & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Tamali Wad, Sr. Adv. along with Mr. Varyam Pandey and Ms. Palak Garg, Advs. for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

17.01.2026

%

1. The Petitioner, by filing the present Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, assails the correctness of the order, whereby her Original Application (O.A.) was dismissed.
2. The Petitioner is working as a Senior Stenographer. She applied for the post of Administrative Officer (AO) pursuant to a Recruitment Notice issued in the year 2018. A Selection Committee was duly constituted for the said purpose.
3. It is claimed by the Petitioner that her name was recommended by the Selection Committee, which included the Secretary of the Department as a member. However, the result of the Selection Committee was never declared. In terms of Regulation 14.2(i) of the Delhi Urban Art Commission (Terms and Conditions of Service)



Regulations, 1993, an appointment is to be given only after due approval of the Central Government. It is further stated that while writing the Annual Performance Appraisal Report (APAR), the Secretary wrote that the Petitioner had been appointed, as she was demitting office on 31.01.2019.

4. Subsequently, a three-member committee was constituted, which, after examining the entire selection process, recommended that the selection be scrapped. The matter was thereafter, placed before the Central Government, which authorized the concerned Commission to take an appropriate decision. An affidavit dated 16.08.2019, has been filed disclosing that the Delhi Urban Art Commission [hereinafter referred to as 'DUAC'] took a conscious decision, to scrap the recommendations of the earlier Selection Committee and recommended initiation of the recruitment process, for the post of AO afresh.

5. Pursuant thereto, a fresh recruitment process was initiated, however, the same was never approved by the Central Government.

6. We have heard learned counsel representing the parties at length and, with their able assistance, perused the paperbook.

7. Though, at one stage, the name of the Petitioner appears to have been recommended by the Selection Committee, but the requisite approval of the Central Government was never granted. Thereafter, DUAC has taken a conscious decision to scrap the said recommendations. In such circumstances, no writ of mandamus can be issued against the Department to appoint the Petitioner, for the following reasons:-

- (i) Mere recommendation by a Selection Committee does not confer any indefeasible right to appointment, particularly



when such recommendation is subject to approval by the Central Government;

(ii) The recommendation of the earlier Selection Committee was scrapped by a conscious and reasoned decision, the correctness of which has not been challenged by the Petitioner; and

(iii) A period of more than seven years has elapsed since the selection process took place.

8. Accordingly, finding no merit, the present Writ Petition along with all pending applications, stands dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JANUARY 17, 2026/sp/ra