



\$~4

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 3545/2026

HARIKESH KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Maj. Kavish Aggarwala,
Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Latika Malhotra, SPC
Mr. Rahul Bhaskar, GP. Major
Kanika Sharma, Army, for
Respondents 1-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

13.04.2026

1. The present writ petition is filed by the Petitioner seeking the following reliefs:

*“I. Issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, Order, or Direction, thereby quashing and setting aside the Impugned Merit List issued for the SSC (Tech)-62 Course (April 2024), and consequently to allot the Petitioner a seat in SSC (Tech)-62 at OTA, Chennai, or in any equivalent upcoming course;
II. Direct the Respondents, in the alternative, that if such appointment cannot be granted at this stage, to adequately compensate the Petitioner for the discrepancy in allotment of vacancies and for the irreparable loss and injury caused to his career”*

2. The Petitioner applied for Permanent Commission in the Indian Army. He appeared for 138th Technical Graduate Course (‘TGC’) and secured 23rd rank in Civil Engineering Branch. For Permanent Commission, 11 vacancies were available for Civil Engineering



Branch, hence, the Petitioner could not secure Permanent Commission. Subsequently, the Petitioner was invited to submit his willingness/ unwillingness to opt for Short Service Commission (Tech) Course at Officers Training Academy, Chennai, for which the Petitioner gave his consent. The Petitioner is essentially aggrieved by denial of appointment to him for the aforesaid course.

3. It is pointed out that the Petitioner could not be selected as there were 248 candidates against 175 vacancies for the said course. It is also submitted that thereafter, the documents of certain candidates were forwarded to Indian Air force, and 15 candidates were selected out of 80 dossiers. It is submitted that the Petitioner was not selected by Air Force as he did not meet the qualification criteria.

4. It is not the case of the Petitioner that any candidate who is ranked junior to him has been selected. Moreover, this recruitment concluded in January, 2024, despite which, the Petition has been filed in the year 2026 with no explanation for the delay.

5. Hence, no ground is made out to issue a writ in favour of the Petitioner.

6. The writ petition stands dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 13, 2026

DV