



\$~DB-11 & 12

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 8524/2025 & CM APPL. 36939/2025 & CM APPL. 36941/2025
DEVYANSHU SURYAVANSHI & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Gauhar Mirza, Mr. Aditya Bharat Manubarwala and Mr. Tanishka Grover, Advocates.

versus

STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION & ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Arnima Dwivedi, CGSC with Mr. Amit Dutta, Mr. Harpal Singh and Mr. Sainyam Bhardwaj, Advocates.

+ W.P.(C) 8525/2025 & CM APPL. 36942/2025 & CM APPL. 36944/2025
ABHI NAITAN & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Gauhar Mirza, Mr. Aditya Bharat Manubarwala and Mr. Tanishka Grover, Advocates.

versus

STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION & ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Arnima Dwivedi, CGSC with Mr. Amit Dutta, Mr. Harpal Singh and Mr. Sainyam Bhardwaj, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

ORDER

% **25.06.2025**

CM APPL. 36940/2025 & CM APPL. 36943/2025 (Exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 8524/2025 & CM APPL. 36939/2025 & CM APPL. 36941/2025

W.P.(C) 8525/2025 & CM APPL. 36942/2025 & CM APPL. 36944/2025

1. It happens to be second round of litigation.
2. Petitioners had earlier filed writ petition which was registered as

W.P.(C) 8524/2025 & W.P.(C) 8525/2025

1



W.P.(C) 4210/2025 and was disposed of on 03.04.2025. While disposing of the abovesaid writ petition, it was observed by this Court that though it did not deem it proper to hold a detailed investigation into the final answer key published by the respondents, it was also supplemented that the petitioners were, *prima facie*, able to establish that there were certain discrepancies in one or two questions in the final answer key.

3. Facts remains that the Original Application in question was, eventually, taken up by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, New Delhi and such Original Application alongwith other connected OAs were dismissed by learned Tribunal, *albeit*, while making certain scathing remarks.

4. During course of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners has invited attention of this Court to paragraph nos. 13 & 14 of the impugned order. It is submitted that in view of abovesaid clear-cut observations, the entire selection process should have been, rather, quashed.

5. Learned counsel for respondents appears on advance notice and, without prejudice to their rights and contentions, accepts notice. She seeks some time to file appropriate reply.

6. Let reply be filed within four weeks with advance copy to the opposite side. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within two weeks thereafter.

7. List before learned Roster Bench on 28.07.2025.

MANOJ JAIN, J
(VACATION JUDGE)

RENU BHATNAGAR, J
(VACATION JUDGE)

JUNE 25, 2025/PU/SS



This is a digitally signed order.

The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.

The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 26/06/2025 at 15:03:59