



\$~7

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

+ **W.P.(C) 590/2026**

SHIVAM BANSAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shantanu Sharma, Mr. Maroof Siddquee and Mr. Ojaswini Tripathi, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vaibhav Kalra, Ms. Neha Bhatnagar and Ms. Yashika Jorwal, Advocates for R-2 to 5.
Mr. Bipul Kumar, GP for R-1.
Mr. Subodh Kumar Kaushik, SPC with Ms. Chhaya Sharma, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

27.01.2026

%

1. The Petitioner participated in the recruitment process for the post of Junior Executive (Air Traffic Control) pursuant to Advertisement No. 05/2023. As per the advertisement, the selection process comprised a Computer Based Test, which the Petitioner undertook on 27th December, 2023. Upon clearing the said test, the Petitioner was shortlisted for the subsequent stages of Application Verification, Voice Test, Psychological Assessment, Psychoactive Substances Testing and Physical Medical Examination, conducted between 22nd February, 2024 and 06th March, 2024.
2. The Petitioner asserts that he successfully cleared all the aforesaid stages, that his identity was verified through documentary and facial



verification, and that his name was included in the list of provisionally selected candidates published by the Respondents, wherein his name appeared at Serial No. 194.

3. The grievance of the Petitioner arises from an email dated 15th May, 2024, whereby he was informed that, despite his provisional selection, issuance of the appointment letter was being withheld on account of verification and confirmation of his thumb impressions, which was stated to be under process.

4. Pursuant to a representation made by the Petitioner, the Respondents, by communication dated 20th November, 2024, afforded him an opportunity for biometric re-verification on 04th December, 2024, which the Petitioner duly attended. However, by a subsequent communication dated 18th December, 2024, the Respondents informed the Petitioner that his provisional selection continued to be withheld on account of thumb impression verification being under process.

5. Aggrieved thereby, and contending that he has complied with all stages of the recruitment process, the Petitioner has approached this Court seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the Respondents to issue an appointment letter in his favour. A further prayer is advanced seeking restraint on any further verification or re-testing.

6. Before considering the aforesaid prayers, it is relevant to note that during the pendency of the present proceedings, the Respondents have issued a communication dated 23rd January, 2026, whereby the Petitioner has been granted another opportunity to appear for biometric verification on 02nd March, 2026. The said communication also indicates that depending upon the outcome of such verification, the Petitioner may be required to



undergo further tests on the same date in accordance with the prescribed procedure.

7. In view of the aforesaid subsequent development, and considering that the Respondents have afforded the Petitioner an additional opportunity for biometric verification, this Court finds no reason to entertain the present petition at this stage.

8. The Petitioner's counsel has orally submitted that the failure of biometric verification on earlier occasions may be attributable to a skin-related medical condition. It is, however, not in dispute that there is no pleading to this effect in the writ petition. This Court does not possess the medical expertise to adjudicate upon such an assertion, nor is any material placed on record in support thereof.

9. Respondent's counsel has clarified that the fresh opportunity has been granted in light of the Petitioner's aforesaid submission regarding a skin-related condition. At this juncture, the Petitioner, while availing the said opportunity, reserves all rights and contentions in the event the verification does not succeed.

10. In view of the foregoing, the present writ petition, along with pending applications, is disposed of in light of the communication dated 23rd January, 2026 issued by the Respondents. It is clarified that in the event the biometric verification process does not culminate successfully, it shall be open to the Petitioner to avail of appropriate remedies in accordance with law.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

JANUARY 27, 2026/nk