



\$~48 & 49

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

+ W.P.(C) 4033/2025 and CM APPLs. 18723/2025, 18725/2025
and 14028/2026

SHIMBHU JAKHAR AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sachin Chauhan, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh
Rudy, CGSC, Ms. Usha Jamnal, Ms. Nyasa
Sharma and Mr. Ankit Khatri, Advocates for
UOI

Mr. Shubhranshu Padhi, Mr. Ashish Yadav,
Mr. Ekansh Sisodia, Advocates for KVS

Mr. M.A. Niyazi, Standing Counsel for
CBSE with Ms. Anamika Ghai Niyazi, Ms.
Kirti Kumari, Ms. Nehmat Sethi and Mr.
Adnan Ashfaq Naqash Advocates for R3
Mr. Rudra Paliwal, GP

+ W.P.(C) 5296/2025 and CM APPL. 24169/2025

JUNAID KHAN AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sachin Chauhan, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Neeraj, SPC with Mr.
Soumyadip Chakraborty, Advocates for UOI

Mr. Shubhranshu Padhi, Mr. Ashish Yadav,
Mr. Ekansh Sisodia, Advocates for KVS

Mr. M.A. Niyazi, Standing Counsel for



CBSE with Ms. Anamika Ghai Niyazi, Ms. Kirti Kumari, Ms. Nehmat Sethi and Mr. Adnan Ashfaq Naqash Advocates for R3

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

ORDER

% **25.04.2026**

The case is being listed today as 3 March 2026 was declared a Holiday vide Notification No. 64/G-4/Genl.-I/DHC dated 27 February 2026.

1. The petitioners were the aspirants to the post of Junior Secretariat Assistant in the Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan¹. The grievance of the petitioners, which was rejected by the Tribunal, was that the Computer Proficiency Test² which, as per para viii(c) of the Detailed Advertisement 15/2022, which governed the present selection, was required to be held bilingually, was held only in English. We may reproduce the said clause thus :

“viii): GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS TO THE CANDIDATES

(c). The Computer based test paper will be bilingual in Hindi & English. The Computer based test paper for the post of PGT (All subjects) and TGT (All subjects) will be conducted separately in single shift as such candidates are requested to apply only for one subject in the respective post. However, candidates can apply for multiple posts if he/she is eligible for multiple posts.”

¹ “KVS”, hereinafter

² “CPT”, hereinafter

W.P.(C) 4033/2025 & connected matters



2. Mr. Shubhranshu Padhi, who appears for the KVS, sought to submit that the requirement of conducting the test bilingually applied only to the Computer Based Test³, which was an initial qualifying test and did not apply to the CPT. He submits that the selection was in three stages, the first being the CBT, the second being the Tying Test and the third the CPT.

3. However, he has not been able to draw our attention to any clause in the advertisement which would support this submission. Rather, in the opening paragraph of the advertisement, it is, *inter alia*, stated thus:

“The recruitment examination will be conducted through Computer Based Test (CBT). If selected, the candidates may be posted anywhere in India on initial posting as per the requirement of the organization.”

4. It appears, therefore, *prima facie* that the expression “CBT” would encompass the entire selection process and not merely an initial CBT.

5. In fact, the remaining clauses of the advertisement appear to refer to the CBT as covering the entire selection process.

6. If that is the case, the impugned order of the Tribunal may be vulnerable to challenge.

7. Mr. Shubhranshu Padhi, appearing for the KVS, also sought to

³ “CBT”, hereinafter
W.P.(C) 4033/2025 & connected matters



submit that there is no requirement of this Court entering into this dispute as the petitioners have not cleared the typing test and therefore, would, in any case, not be entitled to undertake the CPT, which is only undertaken by the persons who qualify the Typing Test. He has drawn our attention to para 10 of the counter affidavit filed in the present case, which reads as under:

“10. That the contents of paragraph 10 under reply are denied. It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in the scheme of examination for the recruitment of Junior Secretariat Assistant is it mentioned that the CPT will be bilingual (i.e., in English and Hindi medium). It is further submitted that the conduct of the Petitioner simply shows that they have not carefully read the notification. It is submitted that the petitioners have failed to differentiate between CBT and CPT since there was no mention about the bilingual Computer Proficiency Test in the scheme of examination notified by Respondent-KVS, and the same was inadvertently printed on the admit card issued for the skill test. The aforesaid error was immediately rectified, and instructions on the admit card for the skill test were also revised. It is submitted that prior to the issue of the admit card, the petitioners should have read the scheme of examination which was notified by Respondent-KVS well in advance, i.e., at the time of the submission of online application forms for the post of Junior Secretariat Assistant.”

8. The averments in the afore-extracted paragraph appear to relate to failure on the part of the petitioners to clear the CPT and not the Typing Test, as is sought to be contended. There appears to be some lack of clarity even in the mind of the counsel appearing for the KVS regarding the exact facts.

9. Accordingly, renotify on 30 April 2026 in the Supplementary List.

10. We direct that a Senior Officer of the KVS, who is suitably



conversant with the facts of this case, should be present in the case to apprise the Court of the actual position. He may carry with him the relevant files, if they are necessary.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

APRIL 25, 2026/yg