



\$~73

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ W.P.(C) 6173/2020, CM APPL. 22100/2020 and CM APPL. 22101/2020

UNION PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONPetitioner

Through: Mr. R. V. Sinha, Ms. A. S. Singh, Ms. Shriya Sharma, Adv.

versus

DR. R.J.R. KASIBHATLA AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Siddharth Dutta, Mr. Pratyush Singh and Mr. Kandarp Raj Dipankar, Adv. for R-1.

Mr. Ruchir Mishra, Mr. Sanjiv Kr Saxena, Mr. Mukesh Kr Tiwari, Ms. Reba Jena Mishra and Ms. Poonam Shukla, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

16.03.2026

%

1. By way of the present Petition, the Petitioner assails the correctness of the Judgment dated 04.03.2020 [hereinafter referred to as 'Impugned Judgment'] passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi [hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'], whereby the Original Application filed by the Respondents, challenging the action of the Petitioner in excluding them from consideration for the post of Joint Secretary and Legal Adviser, came to be allowed.



2. The candidature of the Respondent had been rejected on the ground that he did not possess the requisite experience, the Petitioner having refused to reckon the period spent by the Respondent in practice as an Advocate towards the computation of such experience.

3. The Tribunal, while placing reliance upon the Article 217 of the Constitution of India, 1950, directed that the years spent in the profession of advocacy was liable to be counted towards the requisite experience. Aggrieved thereby, the Petitioner approached this Court by way of this Petition, which has remained pending for the last 06 years.

4. On 12.02.2026, the following order was passed:

“1. The Respondent No.1 is currently working as Joint Secretary, Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice, and is expected to demit office after attaining the age of superannuation in June, 2026.

2. The present Petition has been pending for the last six years.

3. Learned counsel representing the Respondent No.1 prays for some time to obtain instructions as to whether the Respondent No.1 is still interested in contesting the present case.

4. List on 16.03.2026 in the Supplementary List.”

5. Learned counsel representing the Respondent No.1 states that, in view of the subsequent passage of time and the developments that have since unfolded, the said Respondent is no longer desirous of pressing for the implementation of the Impugned Judgment passed by the Tribunal and has no objection if the present Petition is disposed of accordingly.

6. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the controversy that once animated the present Petition has now faded into the realm of the academic. The *lis* having thus lost its living character, the present Petition, along with all pending applications, stands disposed of as



such, leaving the question of law open to be adjudicated.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

MARCH 16, 2026

s.godara/hr