



\$~22

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

+ W.P.(C) 783/2020

MOHD. SALEEM & ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Pawan Reley, Mr. Akshay
Lodhi, Ms. Simran Singh, Mr.
Tanish Rawat and Mr. Utkarsh,
Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain, CGSC
with Mr. Kautilya Birat, Adv.
for R-1/UOI

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

09.03.2026

%

1. The Petitioners before this Court pray for issuance of writ in the nature of *Certiorari* to quash the order dated 04.04.2019 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal [hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal'], whereby their Original Application ('OA') came to be dismissed

2. A Limited Departmental Competitive Exam ('LDCE') was conducted in the year 2005 for the post of Loco Pilot (Goods). The Petitioners, along with several other candidates, participated in the said examination. The Petitioners, however, failed to qualify, whereas 323 candidates were provisionally selected. The said candidates were granted provisional allotment and were eventually promoted.

3. Subsequently, in June 2007, a fresh process was initiated for holding another LDCE for the post of Loco Pilot (Goods). The Petitioners again participated in the said examination and successfully qualified in the year 2008. Pursuant thereto, the Petitioners were also



promoted.

4. However, in the year 2014, the Petitioners approached the Tribunal by filing an OA contending that the result declared in the 2005 LDCE suffered from certain administrative errors, particularly in the grant of marks towards seniority, which, according to them, had adversely affected their selection.

5. The Tribunal dismissed the OA while observing as under:

“When this matter taken up for hearing. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the instant O.A. is filed by the applicants seeking extension of the benefits of a judgment of this Tribunal in O.A. No. 1836/2012 dated 03.04.2013. Whereas, the Hon’ble High Court of Delhi in a Writ Petition No. 6442/2014 dated 04.05.2016 filed against the order of the said decision have allowed the Writ Petition and set aside the orders in the said O.A.

2. In the circumstances, the instant O.A. is also dismissed. No. costs.”

6. Heard learned counsel representing the parties

7. Learned counsel representing the Petitioners submits that the OA was filed in the year 2014 on the strength of a judgment rendered by this Court in a similar matter.

8. On a Court query, learned counsel representing the Petitioners fairly admits that the Petitioners had never challenged the result declared in December 2005 within the prescribed period of limitation. He further admits that the Petitioners subsequently participated in the LDCE conducted in 2007-2008, in which they were successful and were promoted.

9. Learned counsel representing the Petitioners further submits that the Petitioners had been making representations raising the said grievance.

10. It is well settled that neither the making of representations nor a judgment of the Court extends the period of limitation. In terms of



Section 21 of the Central Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, an OA is required to be filed within one year from the date of such final order.

11. In the present case, the result in question was declared in December 2005 (the list having been prepared on 30.12.2005), whereas the OA came to be filed only in the year 2014. The challenge was, therefore, clearly barred by limitation.

12. In view of the aforesaid, this Court finds no infirmity in the order passed by the Tribunal. The present Writ Petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

MARCH 09, 2026/sp/ad/sh