

L.P.A No. 573 of 2023

With

... Appellants

Neeta Singh & Ors. Respondents

L.P.A No. 160 of 2025

... Appellants

Amit Kumar Pandey Respondent

.....

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

: Mr. Ashok Kumar Yadav, Sr. SC-I
Mr. Abhijeet Anand, AC to Sr. SC-I
: Mr. Ajit Kumar, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Suraj Singh, Advocate

.....

Dated: 19.01.2026

With

With

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The learned counsel for the parties agree that the three interim applications in the three L.P.As can be considered and disposed of by a common order.

3. The interim applications seek condonation of delay of 295 days, 146 days and 436 days in instituting the respective appeals against the common judgment and order dated 11.04.2023 passed by the learned Single Judge.

4. The delay of 436 days in instituting the third appeal has been explained by the learned counsel for the applicants pointing out that the certified copy of the judgment and order was not annexed out of inadvertence. Upon realizing this mistake, the certified copy was annexed, resulting the overall delay of 436 days.

5. In effect, learned counsel for the applicants submitted that the reasons for the aforesaid delay in instituting the respective appeals have been explained in the interim applications. It was submitted that approvals were necessary before the L.P.As were actually instituted and this involved consideration of the matters at various levels.

6. The movement of files is explained in the interim applications. The delay is not inordinate. The issue concerns appointments in the police department i.e., A.S.I (Stenographers). Therefore, upon cumulative consideration of all the facts and circumstances, we are satisfied that the cause shown is sufficient.

7. Accordingly, we condone the delay and dispose of the above interim applications.

L.P.A. No. 573 of 2023

With

L.P.A. No. 577 of 2023

With

L.P.A. No. 160 of 2025

8. We have heard learned counsel for the parties. We are satisfied that arguable issues arise particularly in the context of the appellants' submissions that the recruitments rules had not provided for any particular marking patterns for determination of merit. Accordingly, the appellants contended before us that there

was nothing wrong in the selection committee evolving a fair and reasonable criteria of awarding marks based on proficiency in typing, stenography and computer knowledge. The appellants contend that this was not a case of any change of rules after the selection process had commenced or introducing marks for computer knowledge, even though, the resolution had merely prescribed award of marks for typing and stenography.

9. No doubt, the learned counsel for the respondents has his own version. Still, we are satisfied that arguable case has been made out by the appellants warranting the admission of these appeals.

10. We accordingly admit these appeals. We stay the directions issued in the order impugned before us.

11. Post these appeals for final disposal on 18.03.2026.

12. The learned counsel for the parties are requested to prepare short synopsis of their arguments along with decisions, if any, they seek to rely upon, so that, we can proceed with the final hearing of these appeals on the appointed date.

(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)