

Rajdeep Kumar vs.energy Efficiency Service Ltd and Anr.

Rajdeep Kumar vs.energy Efficiency Service Ltd and Anr.

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1212841

Court : Delhi

Decided On : Feb-16-2018

Appellant : Rajdeep Kumar

Respondent : Energy Efficiency Service Ltd and Anr.

Judgement :

\$~28 * IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI % + Date of Order :
February 16, 2018 W.P.(C) 1501/2018 & CM Nos.6146-47/2018 RAJDEEP
KUMAR

... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Parijat Kishore, Advocate versus

... RESPONDENTS

ENERGY EFFICIENCY SERVICE LTD AND ANR. Through: Nemo CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR1

ORDER

(ORAL)

... Petitioner

claims that in response to Advertisement of 30th August, 2017 (Annexure P-1), he had applied for the post of Deputy Manager (Technical) and had participated in the written examination for short listing of candidates for group discussion and as per the RTI information of 1st January, 2018, he had scored 40.40 marks in the written

examination, whereas the lowest qualifying marks were 55.

... Petitioner

claims to have applied for rechecking of answer sheet which according to petitioner was granted but the certified copy of the answer sheet was not provided to petitioner due to confidentiality claimed by first respondent. However, learned counsel for petitioner submits that on rechecking of his answer sheets, it was found that he has actually scored 50.60 marks and since petitioner belongs to OBC category, therefore he was eligible for being W.P.(C) No.1501/2018 Page 1 called for the group discussion which took place in January, 2018. It is submitted by petitioners counsel that there is overlapping in the list of candidates in the General Category as well as in the OBC category, due to which petitioner has been excluded. It is asserted that petitioner is eligible upon scoring of 50.60 marks. It is pointed out by petitioners counsel that the lowest qualifying marks for the OBC category for the post in question is 52.25 marks. Upon a query put to petitioners counsel, it is disclosed that the interviews for the post in question have already taken place in January, 2018 itself, but the results are awaited. The prayer made in this petition is for quashing of the written examination conducted for the post in question and a mandamus is sought to respondent to include petitioners name in the list of shortlisted candidates for group discussion.

2. In the considered opinion of this Court, this petition is premature.

... Petitioner

would have right to challenge the impugned selection after the results are declared.

3. With aforesaid observations, this petition and the applications are disposed of as premature. (SUNIL GAUR) JUDGE FEBRUARY16 2018 mamta W.P.(C) No.1501/2018 Page 2

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com