



\$~66

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

+ **W.P.(C) 946/2026**

DR. HARGOVIND SONI & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: **Mr. Kautilya, Advocate.**

versus

DELHI TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

.....Respondent

Through: **Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC, DTU with
Mr. N. K. Singh, Ms. Aliza Alam &
Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat, Advocates.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

22.01.2026

%

1. Petitioner No. 1 claims to belong to the Other Backward Classes (“OBC”) category, while Petitioners No. 2 and 3 state that they fall in the Unreserved (“UR”) category. All the Petitioners participated in the recruitment process initiated by Delhi Technological University (“DTU”) pursuant to Advertisement No. 02/2024 dated 14th March, 2024, inviting applications for the post of Assistant Professor in various disciplines. The present petition is confined to the discipline of Mechanical Engineering, for which 14 vacancies were earmarked for the UR category and 6 vacancies for the OBC category.

2. The Petitioners participated in the prescribed recruitment process; however, as per the results declared on 13th October, 2025, they were not selected. The selection list placed on record indicates that 13 candidates under the UR category and one candidate under the OBC category were



found meritorious. The remaining vacancies were not filled. Aggrieved by their non-selection, the Petitioners have approached this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

3. The Petitioners contend that they have “*reasons to believe*”, based on “*publicly available information and academic disclosures*”, that several selected candidates in the Mechanical Engineering department were former Ph.D. scholars of faculty members who were themselves part of the interview/selection process. It is further asserted that the Petitioners possess superior academic credentials, qualifications, and experience as compared to the selected candidates. In particular, reference is made to Mr. Kashish Kumar, the sole candidate selected under the OBC category for Mechanical Engineering. According to the Petitioners, their comparative merit is evident from the fact that, under Clause (vii) of the “*Procedure of Selection*” notified by DTU, the Petitioners were exempted from the screening test on account of their higher academic and professional qualifications, whereas the selected candidate was not eligible for such exemption. On this basis, the Petitioners allege arbitrariness, bias, and violation of the principles governing fair and merit-based selection.

4. The Court has considered the aforesaid submissions. It is well settled that judicial interference in matters of selection and appointment is limited and is warranted only where there is a demonstrable case of perversity, *mala fides*, or manifest arbitrariness in the selection process. In the present case, it is not in dispute that the Petitioners were unsuccessful in the selection process. It is also not a case where all the advertised vacancies have been filled. The record reflects that the institution did not find a sufficient number of candidates to meet its standards of merit for appointment to the faculty



positions in question.

5. The mere circumstance that the selected OBC candidate was required to undergo the screening or selection process, while the Petitioners were exempted from the screening test owing to their qualifications, does not, by itself, establish arbitrariness. The exemption from a screening test is only one stage of the process and does not confer any vested right to selection. It is also not the Petitioners' case that the selected OBC candidate lacked the essential qualifications prescribed for the post. In these circumstances, the allegation that candidates with "*inferior*" qualifications have been selected is without any foundation.

6. Similarly, the assertions founded on "*reasons to believe*" and unspecified publicly available information, without supporting material demonstrating bias or procedural impropriety, cannot be a basis for this Court to embark upon a roving or fishing enquiry into the selection process.

7. In view of the above, the Court finds no merit in the present petition. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

JANUARY 22, 2026/hc