



\$~79 to 88

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

+ W.P.(C) 12736/2024 and CM APPL. 53081/2024

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF PRISONS AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Abbhay Behera, Sr. Adv.
and Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with
Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Mr. Sachin
Garg and Ms. Vishruti Pandey,
Advs.

versus

RINKU KUMAR AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Esha Mazumdar, Mr. Setu
Niket, Ms. Muskan Sharma and
Mr. Manish Kumar, Advs.

(80)

+ W.P.(C) 13317/2024, CAV 474/2024, CM APPL. 55663/2024
and CM APPL. 55664/2024

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF PRISONS AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Abbhay Behera, Sr. Adv.
and Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with
Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Mr. Sachin
Garg and Ms. Vishruti Pandey,
Advs.

versus

SUNIL KUMAR AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj and Ms.
Sakshi Saugat, Advs.

(81)

+ W.P.(C) 13672/2024, CM APPL. 57298/2024 and CM
APPL. 57299/2024

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF PRISONS AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Abbhay Behera, Sr. Adv.
and Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with
Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Mr. Sachin
Garg and Ms. Vishruti Pandey,



Advs.

versus

ANUJ AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj and Ms.
Sakshi Saugat, Advs.

(82)

+ W.P.(C) 13875/2024, CM APPL. 58075/2024 and CM APPL.
58076/2024

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF PRISONS AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Abbhay Behera, Sr. Adv.
and Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with
Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Mr. Sachin
Garg and Ms. Vishruti Pandey,
Advs.

versus

SATYAWAN

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Avi Kalra, Mr. Prateek
Lakra and Ms. Shashanki
Kaushik, Advs.

(83)

+ W.P.(C) 14183/2024, CM APPL. 59379/2024 and CM APPL.
59380/2024

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF PRISONS AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Abbhay Behera, Sr. Adv.
and Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with
Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Mr. Sachin
Garg and Ms. Vishruti Pandey,
Advs.

versus

ASHISH VERMA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Avi Kalra, Mr. Prateek
Lakra and Ms. Shashanki
Kaushik, Advs.

(84)

+ W.P.(C) 15747/2024 and CM APPL. 66117/2024



DIRECTOR GENERAL OF PRISONS AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Abbhay Behera, Sr. Adv.
and Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with
Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Mr. Sachin
Garg and Ms. Vishruti Pandey,
Advs.

versus

NAVEEN SHOKEEN

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Avi Kalra, Mr. Prateek
Lakra and Ms. Shashanki
Kaushik, Advs.

(85)

+ W.P.(C) 15752/2024 and CM APPL. 66132/2024

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF PRISONS AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Abbhay Behera, Sr. Adv.
and Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with
Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Mr. Sachin
Garg and Ms. Vishruti Pandey,
Advs.

versus

DEEPAK AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj and Ms.
Sakshi Saugat, Advs.

(86)

+ W.P.(C) 16837/2025 and CM APPL. 69210/2025

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF PRISONS AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Abbhay Behera, Sr. Adv.
and Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with
Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Mr. Sachin
Garg and Ms. Vishruti Pandey,
Advs.

versus

MANDEEP

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj and Ms.
Sakshi Saugat, Advs.



(87)

+ W.P.(C) 9441/2025, CM APPL. 39898/2025, CM APPL. 57442/2025 and CM APPL. 78960/2025

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORSPetitioners
Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC
GNCTD-Services, Mr. Nitesh
Kumar Singh, Ms. Aliza, Alam,
Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat, Adv.

versus

SHEETALRespondent
Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber and Mr.
Anshuman Mehrotra, Adv.

(88)

+ W.P.(C) 9758/2025, CM APPL. 40779/2025 and CM APPL. 12204/2026

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORSPetitioners
Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC
GNCTD-Services, Mr. Nitesh
Kumar Singh, Ms. Aliza, Alam,
Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat, Adv.

versus

KAMAL DABAS AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Rajesh Sharma and Mr.
Rishabh Sharma, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER
15.04.2026

%

1. In compliance with the previous order passed on 07.04.2026.
2. Learned counsel representing the Petitioner has produced photographs along with finger prints of certain Respondents which were taken at the time of entry into exam and during two separate verification drives. As per the report, which is based upon



identification management software developed by Tata Consultancy Service (TCS). The photographs match beyond 90% whereas the fingerprint are not matching at all.

3. In order to go deep into the matter, the Petitioner is also directed to produce similar verification drive taken and its result with regard to candidates who were selected because it has been projected before us that out of 500 selected candidates only 48 failed in this verification drive.

4. The Petitioner is also called upon to explain why there was no *inter se* comparison between the fingerprints obtained at the time of two separate verification drives which took place in the years 2021 and 2022.

5. List on 28.04.2026 in the “Supplementary List”.

6. A photocopy of the Order passed today be kept in the connected matters.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

APRIL 15, 2026/sp/kb