



\$~63

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

+ **W.P.(C) 18839/2025**

DEEPAK

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Satayam Singh, Mr. Aarzu
Khattar and Ms. Vipasha Jain,
Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Dhananjai Rana, CGSC
along with Mr. Naveen, GP and
Mr. Shubham, Adv. for R1, R2
and R4.

Mr. Ravinder Agarwal, Mr.
Manish Kumar Singh and Mr.
Vasu Agarwal, Adv. for R3

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

%

11.12.2025

CM APPLs. 78402-04/2025 (Exemptions)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 18839/2025 & CM APPL. 78401/2025

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioner, challenging the Order dated 08.12.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. 4384/2025, titled ***Sh. Deepak v. Union of India and Ors.***, whereby the learned Tribunal dismissed the O.A. filed by the petitioner herein with the following directions:

*"7. In light of these submissions, we perused
the second experience certificate of the*



applicant, which is annexed at page no. 50 and it shows that the applicant worked in Head Office, Uday Park, New Delhi. There is nothing that establishes that the applicant was working in Gurugram Jail (Govt. of Haryana) or Dasna Jail (Govt. of U.P.). Even if the first and the third experience certificates are taken into consideration together, still the EQ(B) requirement falls short of the mandated 3 years.

8. In these circumstances, we find no infirmity in the impugned order dated 23.10.2025 issued by UPSC. The rejection of the applicant's candidature under LEQ(B) cannot be faulted. The OA is therefore dismissed. No costs."

3. A copy of the Impugned Order dated 08.12.2025 has been handed over by the learned counsel for the petitioner during the course of the hearing and has been taken on record.

4. To give a brief background in which the present petition arises, that the petitioner had participated in the recruitment process for the post of Scientist 'B' (Forensic Psychology) in the Central Forensic Science Laboratory, Directorate of Forensic Science Services, under Vacancy No. 25050509210, published by the respondent no. 3/UPSC *vide* Advertisement No. 05/2025. He was declared ineligible under EQ(B) on the ground of lack of experience.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner possessed the requisite experience for the said post and, in support thereof, relies on the certifications issued by the Urivi Vikram Charitable Trust (Regd.), India Vision Foundation, and the Forensic Science Laboratory. He submits that these are Government-recognised Trusts/Institutions and, therefore, the petitioner has more than three



years' experience in forensic psychology, which is the minimum requirement under the advertisement for the said post.

6. Issue notice.

7. Notice is accepted by Mr. Dhananjai Rana, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent nos. 1, 2 and 4, and by Mr. Ravinder Agarwal, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no. 3.

8. The learned counsels for the respondents drew our attention to the Impugned Order and submitted that the petitioner was claiming the requisite experience by contending that, since he had also worked in Jails, such experience should be counted towards the essential qualifications. They submit that the advertisement clearly stipulates that only the experience gained while working with Government-recognised organisations/institutions is to be accepted. There is nothing on record to show that the Urivi Vikram Charitable Trust (Regd.) or the India Vision Foundation are recognised by the Government.

9. We find that the petitioner has not placed on record any documents to show that the Urivi Vikram Charitable Trust (Regd.) or the India Vision Foundation are Government-recognised organisations/institutions. The petitioner claims to have worked in Jails while working for these institutions/trusts. The petitioner contends that his engagement in Jails itself shows that the said institutions/trusts were recognised by the Government. The learned Tribunal has observed that this may, at best, be a presumption.

10. In our view, the learned Tribunal has, on the other hand, also



proceeded on a presumption that the institutions/trusts are not Government-recognised.

11. Instead of proceeding on assumptions, we consider it appropriate to direct the respondent no. 3 to enquire whether the above-named trusts/institutions are recognised by the Government.

12. We are informed that the interview for the said post is scheduled for tomorrow, that is, 12.12.2025.

13. In view of the above, we direct the respondent no. 3 to allow the petitioner to participate in the interview process, however, the result pertaining to the petitioner shall not be declared and shall be kept in a sealed cover.

14. As only a limited issue is involved in the present petition, list this petition on 22nd December, 2025, in the '*Supplementary List*'.

15. A copy of this order be given *dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

DECEMBER 11, 2025/ys/DG