



\$~19

*

+

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

W.P.(C) 15586/2023

ANIL

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Pranjal Vyas , Mr. Punit
Singla, Mr. Nitin K Gupta &
Mr. Parth Kansal, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukul Singh CGSC with
Ms Ira Singh Adv. for UoI

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

13.02.2026

%

1. Yesterday, that is, on 12.02.2026, following order was passed: -

"1. Pursuant to the direction issued on 17.12.2025, learned counsel representing the Respondent/Union of India has produced a copy of the report dated 03.02.2026 submitted by the Central Forensic Science Laboratory ('CFSL'). The report compares the left thumb impression of the Petitioner on his application form and OMR sheet. As per the said report, the questioned thumb impressions are identical with the specimen left thumb impression of the Petitioner.

2. Learned counsel representing the Petitioner seeks to rely upon the judgment dated 04.11.2024 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in W.P.(C) 2818/2023 captioned Yogesh v. Union of India & Ors.

3. Learned counsel representing the Respondents prays for an adjournment on account of the unavailability of the main counsel.

4. List on 13.02.2026 in the Supplementary List."

2. Learned counsel representing the Respondents has produced copy of report submitted by Central Forensic Science Laboratory



(‘CFSL’). Specific opinion has been formed that the Questioned Thumb Impressions marked as QT-1, QT-2, QDV-1 & QDV-2 are identical with Specimen left thumb impression of Sh. Anil having Roll No. 2201344280 marked as S-14.

3. The candidature of the Petitioner was rejected by Staff Selection Commission on the ground that there is a mis-match between the handwriting in the application form and OMR sheet. However, now, in view of the Report submitted by CFSL, the identity of the Petitioner, who attempted OMR sheet, is established.

4. Learned counsel representing the Respondents, on instructions, submitted that the candidature of the Petitioner shall be recommended to the Department within a period of next 15 days.

5. In view of the statement made by learned counsel representing the Respondent, no further orders are required to be passed, hence, the petition is disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

FEBRUARY 13, 2026

“SS”