



\$~121

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 5154/2025**
DELHI SUBORDINATE SERVICES SELECTION BOARD
AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Through: Mrs.Avnish Ahlawat,
SC/DSSSB with Mr.Nitesh
Kumar Singh, Ms.Laavanya
Kaushik, Ms.Aliza Alam,
Mr.Mohnish Sehrawat &
Mr.Amitoj Chadha, Advs

versus

PARDEEP

.....Respondent

Through: Mr.Anuj Aggarwal, Ms.Divya
Aggarwal & Mr.Pradeep
Kumar, Advs

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

ORDER

% **23.04.2025**
CM APPL. 23460/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 5154/2025 & CM APPL. 23459/2025

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioner, challenging the Order dated 22.08.2024, passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (in short, 'learned Tribunal') in OA No. 2834/2019, titled ***Pardeep v. Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board (DSSSB) & Anr.***, allowing the said O.A. filed by the respondent herein and directing the petitioner to reconsider the candidature of the respondent afresh for appointment to the post of



TGT (Natural Science) (Male), Post Code No. 135/17, as per his merit.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the learned Tribunal has erred in interpreting the condition of age relaxation as provided in Advertisement No. 04/2017 dated 20.12.2017, inasmuch as it requires a candidate to be working for at least 120 working days in an 'academic year' starting from 2012-13 to 2016-17, subject to a maximum of 5 years' relaxation.

4. He submits that in the present case, instead of taking the 'academic year', the respondent had shown his working for more than 120 days in the manner reflected below:

<i>Academic Year</i>	<i>Time Period</i>	<i>Days</i>	<i>>< 120 Days as per Advertisement</i>
2012-13	18.10.2012-10.05.2013	123	>120 days as on 31.03.2013*
2015-16	01.07.2015-31.05.2016	238	>120 days as on 31.03.2016
2016-17	01.07.2016-03.06.2017	235	>120 days as on 31.03.2017
2017-18		152	>120 days as on 31.03.2018

5. He submits that the same, therefore, was rightly rejected by the petitioner.

6. Issue notice.

7. Notice is accepted by Mr.Anuj Aggarwal, the learned counsel on behalf of the respondent.



8. He prays for time to file a reply. Let a counter affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within a period of three weeks thereafter.
9. List on 9th October, 2025.
10. In the meantime, the operation of the Impugned Order shall remain stayed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

APRIL 23, 2025/rv/ik

Click here to check corrigendum, if any