



2025:DHC:2116-DB



\$~5

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI***Date of decision: 28.03.2025***

+

W.P.(C) 2643/2025

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar, SPC –UOI
with Mr. Rahul Kumar Sharma,
Mr. Yash Narain, Advs.

versus

SESETTI MAHIDHARNATH

.....Respondent

Through: Respondent through VC

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR****NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (Oral)****CM APPL. 12559/2025 (Exemption)**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 2643/2025 and CM APPL. 12558/2025

2. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 05.08.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as 'learned Tribunal') in Original Application No. 3868/2017 (hereinafter referred to as 'OA') titled as *Sesetti Mahidharnath v. Union of India and Anr.*, allowing the said O.A. filed by the respondent herein, with the following directions :-

*"12. For the aforementioned reasons,
the O.A. is allowed and the respondents
are directed to consider the candidature*

Signature Not Verified

Signed By: VIJAYA
LAKSHMI DOBHAL
Signing Date: 02.04.2025
16:20:58

W.P.(C) 2643/2025

Page 1 of 3



2025:DHC:2116-DB



of the applicant for appointment to the suitable post as per his merit in CGLE-2016, after taking into account the marks awarded to him in Tier-Ill Examination as per Annexure P/I coupled with the marks awarded in other levels, if he is found otherwise suitable and eligible, against the vacancy kept vacant for him. However, it is made clear that he will get the benefits, such as, salary, seniority etc. prospectively, i.e. from the date of his appointment only.”

3. The respondent had virtually appeared before this Court on 10.03.2025 and stated that he was not interested in pursuing this matter. He was asked to email a formal application directed to the Court Master with a copy marked to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. He has emailed an application wherein he, *inter alia*, states that he has been working in a bank near his home town for almost six years now and is, therefore, no longer interested in joining the Staff Selection Commission.

5. He appears again virtually before us today and reiterates that he is not interested in the offer of employment in terms of the Impugned Order.

6. In view of the above statement, the Impugned Order is set aside and the petitioners are relieved from complying with the directions issued by the learned Tribunal.



2025:DHC:2116-DB



7. The petition along with pending application stands accordingly disposed of.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

March 28, 2025/Ab/Sm/IK

Click here to check corrigendum, if any