



2025:DHC:1312-DB



\$~

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

Reserved on: 18 December 2024

Pronounced on: 28 February 2025

+ W.P.(C) 920/2024, CM APPL. 3795/2024

PRAGYA SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Malvika Trivedi, Sr. Adv.
with Mr. Arvind Kr. Gupta, Mr. Shailender
Salaria, Mr. Abhisumat Gupta and Mr. Arun
Bhattacharya, Advs.

versus

DELHI SUBORDINATE SERVICES SELECTION

BOARD THROUGH ITS DIRECTOR & ORS.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC along
with Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, and Mr. Hitanshu
Mishra, Advs. with Mr. Sachin Varun
(System Analyst)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA

JUDGMENT

28.02.2025

%

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. “Oh, what a tangled web we weave

When first we practice to deceive”

said Sir Walter Scott, in his celebrated poem, ‘Marmion’. We are
painfully reminded of the immortal quote.

2. We could have said more, but merely state that, having perused



the entire record holistically, we find, to our discomfiture, that the petitioner has, by economizing the truth, taken up the time, first of the Central Administrative Tribunal¹ and, thereafter, of this Court, canvassing a relief which, to her plain knowledge, she is not entitled.

The Dispute

3. The petitioner applied for recruitment to the post of Welfare Officer/Probation Officer/Prison Welfare Officer, in response to an advertisement issued by the Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board², the respondent herein. Her candidature stands rejected *vide* Rejection Notice dated 6 March 2020, for failure to upload the e-dossier containing the requisite documents during the period 28 January 2020 to 11 February 2020. OA 898/2020³, instituted by her before the Central Administrative Tribunal⁴ stands dismissed by judgment dated 19 December 2023. She has approached this Court, challenging the judgment of the Tribunal.

Facts

4. In view of the nature of the dispute, it would be beneficial to proceed through the rival pleadings, which set out the stands of the parties.

Stand of the petitioner in the OA

¹ “the Tribunal” hereinafter

² “DSSSB”, hereinafter

³ **Pragya Singh v DSSSB & others**

⁴ “the Tribunal” hereinafter



2025:DHC:1312-DB



5. The petitioner submitted, in her OA, thus:

(i) *Vide* Vacancy Notice/Advertisement No. 02/2019 dated 29 January 2019, bearing Post Code 14/19, the DSSSB invited online applications for recruitment to various posts including the posts of Welfare Officer/Probation Officer/Prison Welfare Officer. The selection was to be by a written examination, following which the candidates were to submit their documents by e-dossier, which would be verified.

(ii) The petitioner applied. She is an Unreserved⁵ candidate. There were 55 UR vacancies. The petitioner applied. A copy of the Admit Card stated to have been issued to her, which was annexed to her OA before the Tribunal, shows her Roll Number to be 4500000120 and required her to attend the examination between 8.30 am and 9.30 am at the Govt Girls Senior Secondary School, Saboli, Delhi-110093⁶. It also contains columns for the signatures of the Invigilator and the Authorized Signatory/Controller of the Examination, which contain their respective signatures, and the petitioner's thumb impression.

(iii) The petitioner appeared in the written examination on 24 November 2019. The fact that she appeared was apparent from the fact that, on her Admit Card, the Invigilator and Controller of Examination had appended their signatures.

⁵ UR

⁶ "the Saboli School" hereinafter



2025:DHC:1312-DB



(iv) The results of all candidates, who had applied in response to the advertisement, were uploaded by the DSSSB on its portal *vide* Notice No. 880 dated 23 January 2020. Candidates were required to upload their documents via e-dossier, the form of which was provided in the Notice. The e-dossier link was activated only for candidates who had been provisionally shortlisted.

(v) Against the petitioner's name, in the Notice dated 23 January 2020, was entered the remark: "You have not appeared in this exam." No link was provided against her name, by activating which she could upload her documents by e-dossier.

(vi) The petitioner made several attempts to contact the DSSSB to ascertain why she was reflected, in the Notice dated 23 January 2020, as not having appeared in the exam, whereas she had appeared, but to no avail. She also made a complaint on the website of the Public Grievance Monitoring System⁷ of the GNCTD on 17 February 2020.

(vii) The list of candidates who were provisionally qualified for selection, after scrutiny of documents uploaded by them, was released on 6 March 2020, *vide* Notice No. 968. The Notice also contained the names of candidates who had not uploaded their documents by e-dossier, and gave them one more opportunity to do so, between 16 March 2020 and 25 March 2020.

⁷ "PGMS" hereinafter



2025:DHC:1312-DB



(viii) On the same date, i.e. 6 March 2020, the DSSSB also issued Rejection Notice No. 969, which was impugned by the petitioner before the Tribunal. The candidates whose candidature was rejected were indicated in the Rejection Notice, but by Roll Number. The Rejection Notice, to the extent it concerns the petitioner, read thus:

**“REJECTION NOTICE NO. 969
Welfare Officer/Probation Officer/capitalism Welfare Officer
In Social Welfare Department, GNCTD
Post Code 14/19**

The shortlisted candidates were given opportunity through Notice No. 880 issued vide F. No. 1 (416)/CC-II/DSSSB/2020/70 247-55 dated 23/01/2022 upload their documents in the e-dossier link activated on OARS Module with effect from 28/01/2020 to 11/02/2020 with specific directions that if any candidate fails to upload the e-dossier during the said period, his/her candidature but be rejected and no further opportunity for uploading e-dossier will be given on whatsoever grounds. However, the following candidates had failed to upload their e-dossier and therefore, there candidature are rejected for failing to upload their e-dossier during the scheduled period, i.e., 28/01/2020 to 11/02/2020: –

Sr. No.	Roll No.	Category
1	450000120	UR

This issues with prior approval of the Competent Authority.

DEPUTY SECRETARY, DSSSB”

This, according to the petitioner, indicated that the comment, in the Notice dated 23 January 2020, that the petitioner had not appeared in the examination, was incorrect.

(ix) In February-March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic struck, as a result of which the petitioner was unable to effectively prosecute her case. Ultimately, she received a



2025:DHC:1312-DB



response to her complaint on the PGMS, which indicated that action had been taken on the complaint on 3 July 2020. The response read thus:

“As per record candidate having Roll No 450000120 was appeared in the written examination under post code 14/19 and scored 176.75 marks in the written examination. The marks of the candidate was released *vide* Notice No 880 dated 23.01.2020 informing therein candidates get you there marks by login into their account in OARS module on www.dsssbonline.nic.in. Vide above said notice cut off marks for shortlisting of candidate in the respective category for uploading e-dossier, was also declared. E-dossier link was opened during the period 28.01.2020 to 11.02.2020. Since candidate having Roll No. 450000120 did not upload documents in e-dossier accordingly her candidature was rejected vide Rejection Notice No 969 dated 06.03.2020.”

Thus, the petitioner had secured marks well above the cut-off marks of 132.75 fixed for UR category candidates.

(x) Thus, owing to an apparent fault at the end of the DSSSB, the petitioner, who had qualified in the written examination, was not provided the link using which she could have uploaded her documents in e-dossier format, resulting in the rejection of her candidature for failure to do so.

As efforts at approaching the respondents for succour were futile, the petitioner moved the Tribunal by way of OA 898/2020, praying that the Rejection Notice dated 6 March 2020 be quashed, she be permitted to upload her documents in e-dossier format and be permitted to take part in the further selection process following the Advertisement dated 29 January 2019.



2025:DHC:1312-DB



6. The DSSSB and the GNCTD filed separate affidavits before the Tribunal by way of response to the petitioner's OA.

Affidavit of DSSSB before the Tribunal

7. The DSSSB, in its counter-affidavit before the Tribunal, alleged that the petitioner had applied for the examination under two Registration Nos, giving the same date of birth but under two Mobile Numbers. It was alleged that she had applied under Registration Number 29091993041930782009⁸ and 2909199341930782009, with the emphasized "0" being the only difference, giving her Mobile Numbers as 7206814002 and 8813848583 respectively. Copies of the two Applications allegedly submitted by the petitioner were annexed to the counter-affidavit. The entries in two Applications, as filed by the DSSSB with its counter-affidavit before the Tribunal and as allegedly submitted by the respondent, read as under:

Under Registration No. 2909199341930782009

"Registration No.	2909199341930782009
Application No.	73984711
Roll No. (Tier-I)	Roll number not released.
Roll No. (Tier-II)	Not Available.
Roll No. (Tier-III)	Not Available.
Name	Pragya Singh
Gender	F

⁸ For the sake of convenience, the intervening "0" is highlighted in future references to this Roll No.



2025:DHC:1312-DB



Date of Birth 29-09-1993

Father's Name Sahab Singh

Mother's Name Usha Rani

Spouse Name

Current Address 111/9, Diya Apartments (B-5), Kishangarh
Gaushala Marg, Vasant Kunj

Permanent Address 111/9, Diya Apartments (B-5), Kishangarh
Gaushala Marg, Vasant Kunj

E-mail Id singhpragya211@gmail.com

Mobile No. 8813848583

Nationality Indian

Category UR

Sub-Category

Fee Status Exempted

Payment Date

ID Type Not Available

Name on ID Not Available

ID Number Not Available

Apply Date 3/2/2019 5:27:29 PM

Final Submit Date 3/2/2019 5:27:29 PM

Postcard Size Photo Upload
Date Not Available

Educational Qualification

1	Post Graduation	Master Degree in Social Work/M.A. (Sociology/Post Graduate degree in Criminology)	73.62
2	General	Passed Hindi at Secondary	



2025:DHC:1312-DB



		Level"	
--	--	--------	--

Experience

Under Registration No. 29091993041930782009

"Registration No. 29091993041930782009

Application No. 10580405

Roll No. (Tier-I) 450000120

Roll No. (Tier-II) Not Available.

Roll No. (Tier-III) Not Available.

Name Pragya Singh

Gender F

Date of Birth 29-09-1993

Father's Name Sahab Singh

Mother's Name Usha Rani

Spouse Name

Current Address 111/9, Diya Apartments (B-5), Kishangarh
Gaushala Marg, Vasant KunjPermanent Address 111/9, Diya Apartments (B-5), Kishangarh
Gaushala Marg, Vasant KunjE-mail Id amitgohana@gmail.com

Mobile No. 7206814002

Nationality Indian

Category UR

Sub-Category

Fee Status Exempted

Payment Date

ID Type Not Available



2025:DHC:1312-DB



Name on ID Not Available

ID Number Not Available

Apply Date 3/2/2019 6:45:03 PM

Final Submit Date 3/2/2019 6:45:03 PM

Postcard Size Photo Upload
Date Not Available

Educational Qualification

1	Post Graduation	Master Degree in Social Work/M.A. (Sociology/Post Graduate degree in Criminology)”	62.00
---	-----------------	--	-------

Experience

Both the Application Forms had the photograph of the petitioner as well as her signatures and thumb impressions.

8. The counter-affidavit alleged that the applicant had appeared in the examination under Registration No. 29091993041930782009, against which the Roll Number 450000120 was assigned and that she had apparently checked for her result in the Notice dated 23 January 2020 against Registration No. 2909199341930782009, against which it was correctly stated that no one had appeared in the examination. However, the counter-affidavit candidly acknowledges, in para 9, in so many words, that “the applicant scores 176.75 marks in the written examination and was shortlisted for uploading e-dossier in UR Category *vide* Notice No. 880 dated 23.01.2020”. Thus, the stand of the DSSSB, in its counter-affidavit before the Tribunal, was that (i) the applicant had submitted the application twice, under different phone numbers (7206814002 and 8813848583) and different e-mail ids (singhpragya211@gmail.com and amitgohana@gmail.com), on



2025:DHC:1312-DB



the same day, within a short span of time, under Registration Nos 2909199341930782009 and 29091993041930782009, (ii) she appeared under Roll No. 4500000120, which was assigned against the Application bearing Registration No. 29091993041930782009, (iii) as a result, against Registration No. 2909199341930782009, the Notice dated 23 January 2020 correctly noted that no candidate had appeared in the examination and (iv) as a result, she failed to upload her documents in e-dossier form, for which the link was appropriately provided against Registration No. 29091993041930782009, under which the petitioner had appeared and scored 176.75 marks. Thus, contended the DSSSB, the petitioner was not entitled to relief.

Petitioner's rejoinder to counter-affidavit of DSSSB before the Tribunal

9. The petitioner filed a rejoinder, before the Tribunal, to the above counter-affidavit of the DSSSB. She denied having submitted two applications for appearing in the examination. In supporting her stand, the petitioner submitted thus:

(i) After she had submitted her application, she received confirmation of receipt of the application on her phone number 8813848583 on 24 February 2019. The message indicated her Registration Number to be 2909199341930782009, which was a combination of her date of birth (29 September 1993), Roll Number (4193078) and the year in which she passed her Class X examination (2009). A screenshot of the message was filed by the petitioner. It read thus:



2025:DHC:1312-DB



“Text Message
24 Feb 2019, 2:31 PM

You are successfully registered in OARS at DSSSB, Regn. No. 2909199341930782009. It is a combination of Date of Birth, Roll No and Passing year of 10th.”

(ii) She also received a second message, stating that her application had been finally submitted under Application No. 73984711, which read:

“2 March 2019, 5:27 PM

Your Application for the post of Welfare Officer/Probation Officer/Prison Welfare Officer (Post Code: 14/19) has been finally submitted. Your Application No. is 78984711.”

(iii) She was unaware of the phone number 7206814002, under which the second application was allegedly submitted. It did not belong her, or to any of her family members. A check on the TrueCaller app revealed that the number 7206814002 belonged to one Amit Kumar, whom she did not know.

(iv) The Admit Card, using which she undertook the examination, was downloaded by feeding in her Registration Number as 2909199341930782009 (minus the “0”) and Application No as 73984711.

(v) While checking the result online, a candidate had to feed in her date of birth, Class X Roll No and the year in which she passed Class X. The petitioner, accordingly, entered “29091993”, “4193078” and “2009”, and the result that was displayed was that she had not appeared in the examination. The stand of the DSSSB that the petitioner had checked for her



2025:DHC:1312-DB



result against the wrong Registration No. was, therefore, incorrect.

(vi) Using the details which had to be fed in while applying in response to the Advertisement, i.e. the date of birth, Class X Roll Number and year of passing Class X, in the case of the petitioner, the only possible Registration No was 2909199341930782009. In the event that, using these details, the respondent had generated a second Registration No, 29091993041930782009, the petitioner could not be blamed for it.

In any event, submitted the petitioner, the respondent ought to have responded to her numerous attempts to reach out to them to look into the matter, but turned a deaf ear. The petitioner could not, therefore, be subjected to prejudice.

Additional-affidavit of GNCTD

10. The GNCTD, in its affidavit filed before the Tribunal, by way of response to the petitioner's rejoinder, disputed the petitioner's contention that she was unaware of Amit Kumar, or the Registration No 29091993041930782009, was incorrect and mischievous "because the candidate gave the examination against roll no. 450000120, which was issued against the registration no. 29091993041930782009, having application no. 10580405 with registered mobile no. 7206814002." It is further asserted that the Admit Card could be downloaded only after furnishing the details of the Application No



2025:DHC:1312-DB



and the date of birth of the candidate, and that, therefore, it could not be believed that the petitioner was unaware of the Registration No 29091993041930782009.

11. The petitioner filed a reply to the above additional affidavit of the GNCTD, emphatically denying having ever applied and generated the Registration No 29091993041930782009.

Orders passed by the Tribunal

12. The Tribunal, in view of the nature of the dispute, deemed it appropriate to direct a responsible official of the respondents to be present before it with the records. Following this, an interlocutory order was passed on 9 December 2023, followed by the final judgement dated 19 December 2023, whereby the petitioner's OA was dismissed.

13. Paras 3.5 (numbered twice) to 5 of the impugned judgement of the Tribunal merits reproduction, *in extenso*, thus:

“3.5 In addition, on the last date of hearing, i.e., on 30.11.2023, this Tribunal was of the view that there would be physical copy of all the documents which the applicant for the said examination submitted online for perusal of the relevant record may be useful in removing the clouds of doubt in the present matter. Let a responsible official along with the relevant record assist us on the next date of hearing.

3.5 In terms of the directions given on the last date of hearing, i.e., 30.11.2023, on 09.12.2023, following was observed: -

“Shri Satish Kanojia, Section Officer, DSSSB, is present in the court to assist us. Shri Kanojia explained the system of filling online application leading to the generation of the online registration and roll number. He clarifies that in the case of the



2025:DHC:1312-DB



applicant whose name is Pragya Singh, the relevant information had been sent on the mobile number given in the application form requesting to upload all the requisite documents for the post of Welfare Officer/ Probation Officer/ Prison Welfare Officer under post code 14/19 within the prescribed time, failing which the candidature will be rejected. He further clarifies that if there was other registration number and roll number, the same would have been generated by someone by filling up the application form online and against that no one had participated in the examination.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents further clarifies that the Pragya Singh who participated in the exam and secured 176.75 marks was given the information on the mobile number recorded in the application form and the same mobile is not hers but of one Amit Kumar.

3. Against the background of these facts, the contention of the applicant that she was not informed does not appear correct. He further draws attention to the specific averment made in the additional counter affidavit dated 19.10.2020, para 4 of the same reads as under:

“4. In the rejoinder the applicant has submitted that she was not aware regarding registration no. 29091993041930782009 in which mobile no. 7206814002 has been mentioned since this mobile no pertains to Sh. Amit Kumar and she has not known to that person. It is submitted that the said submission of the Applicant in the rejoinder is incorrect and mischievous because the candidate gave the examination against the roll no 4500000120, which was issued against the registration no. 29091993041930782009, having application no. 10580405 with registered mobile no. 7206814002. It is very surprising that if the applicant was not aware of the registration no 20091993041930782009, application no. 10580405 and mobile no. 7206814002 in that case how was she able to download the online Admit Card having roll no. 4500000120, since the Admit card can only be downloaded after entering the details of application number and date of birth of the candidate.

Further, details of applications with registration nos. in post code 14/19 submitted in the name of the applicant is as under:

Copy of application no. 10580405 having registration no. 29091993041930782009 is attached as Annexure R-1



2025:DHC:1312-DB



Copy of application no 73984711 having registration no. 2909199341930782009 is attached as Annexure R-2

Copy of Admit Card having roll no. 4500000120 issued to the applicant is attached as Annexure R3.

Copy of admit card having roll No. 4500001912 issued to the applicant is attached as Annexure R-4.

Copy of OARS showing that the roll no. 4500000120 was issued against registration no. 29091993041930782009 is attached as Annexure R5.

Details of two admit card(s) in the name of the applicant Pragya Singh are as under: -

S No.	Registration No.	Registered Mobile No.	Application No.	Date of submission	Admit card issued having roll no.
1	29091993041930782009	7206814002	10580405	02/03/2019	4500000120
2	2909199341930782009	8813848583	73984711	24/02/2019	4500001912

4. Shri A K Behera, learned senior advocate appearing on behalf of the applicant submits that due to a lapse of time of more than three years, the present matter would not be amenable to any inquiry or investigation. The issue is to be decided keeping in view of a holistic perspective especially the fact that the applicant has secured 176.75 marks, highest marks in the examination, and even if there were two application forms and even if there was some mismatch of telephone number and some other particulars, the same does not obviate the fact that the applicant has secured 176.75 marks and hence topped the examination. Even if the dues with respect to two application forms etc. still persists, there is no sufficient reason as to deny the applicant of her rightful claim to her appointment to the examination.

5. Learned counsel for the parties confirm that they have nothing further to add in terms of the arguments put forth.

6. We place on record our appreciation to Shri Satish Kanojia, SO, DSSSB who has very effectively assisted us in understanding the issue at hand. Our appreciation contained in this order is to be placed on the personal file and APAR dossier of the officer.”

4. ANALYSIS



2025:DHC:1312-DB



4.1 On careful examination of the above narrated facts, what emerges on record is that the name in both the application(s) is Pragya Singh; fathers' name in both is also Sh. Sahab Singh; the addresses are also common; the date of birth too is identical. However, in one case the Masters Degree is of the year 2014 from Delhi University and in the other it is from IGNOU of the year 2016. However, mobile numbers and email ids are different. Accordingly, both have been given different registration numbers and different roll numbers. The date of the application is also different in both the cases. Curiously, the time of the examination for both the applications by Pragya Singh is the same but the centres are different.

4.2 The major difference in both the application form(s) i.e., Registration No: 2909199341930782009 and Registration No: 29091993041930782009 is that of "ZERO". She was under the bona fide impression that this was probably on account of a technical error. The applicant made categorical statement that Annexure R-2 which is her application form, bears roll No. 4500001912. She further denies that Annexure R-1 is not her application, which bears Roll Number as 4500000120. The Registration No: 29091993041930782009 as per record candidate having Roll No 4500000120 has appeared in the written examination under post code 14/19 and scored 176.75 marks in the written examination. She denies that registration no. 29091993041930782009 and asserts that her registration number is 2909199341930782009, wherein it is shown that applicant has not participated in examination.

4.3 On what basis, the applicant is making an assertion that she has secured 176.75 marks and hence, topped the examination, while neither it is the case of the applicant that she had bonafidely filled two application forms/got two separate registration numbers due to technical glitch, nor is she claiming that two application forms/admit cards are that of hers or that registration no. 29091993041930782009 belongs to her against which marks scored are 176.75. What she is claiming is registration no. 29091993041930782009 against which there is a remark "did not appear" in examination.

4.4 The case is not so simple that even if there were two application forms and there was some mismatch of telephone number and some other particulars, to say the least that the same does not obviate the fact that the applicant has secured 176.75 marks and hence, topped the examination. The grant of relief(s) in service jurisprudence is neither based on hypothetical assumption or presumption as per the Rules/instructions governing service conditions. It cannot be assumed that even if the differences with respect to two application forms/admit cards/registration numbers etc. still persist, the applicant has a rightful claim to appointment. The case set up by the applicant is not mix-up either. No objections have been raised for issuance of two admit cards at any point of time. It is only when counter affidavit taking the objections of two sets of admit cards, the applicant has stated in the rejoinder that she was not aware regarding



registration no. 29091993041930782009 in which mobile no. 7206814002 has been mentioned since this mobile no. pertains to Sh. Amit Kumar and she is known to that person. It would be erroneous in assuming a situation without supporting evidence. On the basis of the principle of preponderance of probability, benefit of doubt cannot be given to applicant.

4.5 We are also reminded of the fact that after a gap of more than three years and also applicant being at the young age of career advancement, we do not propose to enter into any inquiry and/or investigation for filling two sets of application form(s). Even though, in strict sense, the two applications cannot be said to be duplicate, the consequences of such conclusion would have been entirely different. The respondents authorities would not have gained anything on account of rejection. There are no malafide attributed to respondent authorities either.

4.6 When there are two set of application form(s), two registration numbers, two admit cards of the same applicant having quite a distinct particular to each other, it would be improper to draw an inference in favour of the applicant. We surely are empathetic to the applicant, but the benefit of the doubt cannot be extended to her as the subject is appointment to a public post, and this calls for probity and transparency of the highest order.

5. CONCLUSION

In view of above, the present original application is dismissed. All pending application(s), if any, are also disposed of. No costs.”

14. Aggrieved by the above judgement of the Tribunal, the petitioner has approached this Court by means of the present writ petition.

Observations and Findings

15. Obviously the only issue which arises for consideration is whether the petitioner in fact submitted one application form or two application forms. In case she submitted two application forms, the matter must rest there. She could not have submitted two application



forms and approached the Tribunal, or even this Court, seeking relief.

16. Equally, if the Court arrives at the conclusion that the petitioner did submit two application forms, the entire case that she has built up, repeatedly asserting that she submitted only one application form, becomes *ipso facto* completely false, and the petitioner stands, thereby, disentitled to relief.

17. The Petitioner has, before the Tribunal as well as before this Court, being steadfastly maintaining the stand that she submitted only one application form, against which she was assigned Roll No. 4500000120, using which she appeared in the examination.

18. Having gone through the entire record, and the course of proceedings before the Tribunal and before this Court, we are of the view that the entire petition must fail on the basis of the averments contained in a single paragraph of the petition which, we are painfully constrained to observe, discloses that the petitioner has, throughout, been guilty of suppression and misstatement.

19. Para 19 of the writ petition reads thus :

“19. That in response to the OA filed by petitioner, the respondents file their counter reply, a copy of which is annexed herewith and marked as Annexure P-17. In the counter reply filed by the Respondents, it was for the 1st time disclosed by the Respondents that the petitioner had allegedly made two applications for the post in question. The 1st application had application No. 73984711 and for which registration number 2909199341930782009 was assigned and registered mobile number was 8813848583. The 2nd application allegedly had application number as 10580405 and register number as 29091993041930782009 with alleged registered mobile number as 7206814002. *The copies of the aforesaid*



2025:DHC:1312-DB



*application forms were filed along with the counter reply and the same being marked as Annexure P-18 (Colly). Even the mobile number i.e. 7206814002 mentioned on the 2nd application form does not belong to petitioner or anyone her family and belongs to one Mr Amit Kumar. The petitioner does not know any person with name Amit Kumar. It is rather beyond imagination of a prudent mind that while making an application by a candidate shall give mobile number of unknown person. ... The Respondents further alleged that the petitioner had appeared against registration number 29091993041930782009, for which she was roll No. 4500000120. Whereas it is the contention of petitioner that she was currently only one registration number 2909199341930782009 vide message dated 24.02.2019 and her application number was 73984711, which was conveyed to her vide SMS dated 02.03.2019 on her mobile number 8813848583. It was losing the said registration number (2909199341930782009) and application number (73984711) that *the petitioner had downloaded roll number 4500001912 and had appeared in the exam on the said roll no.* The signature of the invigilator of the admit card-based testimony to the said fact.”*

(Emphasis supplied)

20. As per the averments contained in para 19 of the writ petition, extracted *supra*, the petitioner claims that the “first application”, with Application No. 73984711 and Mobile No. 8313848583, and for which the Registration Number 2909199341930782009 was allotted, was hers, whereas the “second application”, which had Application No. 10580405, Mobile No. 7206814002, and Registration No. 29091993041930782009, was completely unknown to her. She asserts the first application as hers, and the second application as having been either submitted by some unknown person or erroneously generated by the system.

21. We may note, significantly, that the petitioner never chose to place on record, with the OA, the rejoinder, or the reply to the additional effort to be filed by the GNCTD before the Tribunal, her application form or her Master’s degree certificates, for reasons which would presently become painfully obvious. Possibly because the



2025:DHC:1312-DB



respondents, with their counter-affidavit before the Tribunal, placed the two application forms on record, the petitioner has had no option but to aver something with respect to the application forms in her writ petition. She has chosen to claim the first application form to be hers, and to completely disown the second application. Indeed, she may have no other option, as Roll No. 4500000120, as well as the reference to IGNOU as the University from which the petitioner obtained her Masters Degree, find reference only in the first application form. The second application form, which the petitioner disowns, shows her Roll No to be 4500001912 and Delhi University as the University from where she obtained her Masters' degree.

22. We reproduce, hereunder, the aforesaid "first application", which the petitioner asserts to be hers, and the "second application", which she disowns:

First Application (asserted by petitioner)

**GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI
Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board
Application Form**

Post Code: 14/19

Application No 73984711

Registration No: 29091993419330782009

Candidate Name: Pragya Singh

Father Name: Sahab Singh

Address: 111/9 Diya Apartment 85, Kishangarh, Gaushala Marg, Vasant Kunj, Delhi

Permanent Address: 111/9 Diya Apartment 85, Kishangarh, Gaushala Marg, Vasant Kunj, Delhi

Date of Birth: 29/09/1993

Mobile No: 8813848583

Email ID : Singhpragya211(at)gmail(dot)com



2025:DHC:1312-DB



Category: UR

Sub Category:

Caste Certificate Issuing State: Delhi

Gender: F

Roll No: 45000001912 (as against 4500000120 which petitioner claims to be her Roll No.)

Qualification:

S. No.	Qualification	Passing	Percentage
1	Master Degree in Social work M.A. (Sociology) Post Graduate degree in Criminology	<u>Delhi University (as against IGNOU from where petitioner claims to have obtained her Masters' degree)</u>	73.62"

Second Application (disowned by petitioner)
GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI
Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board
Application Form

Post Code: 14/19

Application No 10580405

Registration No: 29091993041930782009

Candidate Name: Pragya Singh

Father Name: Sahab Singh

Address: 111/9 Diya Apartment 85 KISHANGARH GAUSHALA MARG
VASANT KUNJ DELHI.

Permanent Address: 111/9 Diya Apartment 85 KISHANGARH
GAUSHALA MARG VASANT KUNJ DELHI.

Date of Birth: 29/09/1993

Mobile No:7206814002

Email ID : amitgohana@gmail.com

Category: UR

Sub Category:

Cast Certificate Issuing State: Delhi

Gender: F

Roll No: 4500000120 (claimed by petitioner to be her Roll No.)



2025:DHC:1312-DB



Qualification:

S.no.	Qualification	Passing	Percentage
1.	Master Degree in Social work M.A. (Sociology) Post Graduate degree in Criminology	IGNOU (<i>claimed by petitioner to be the University from where she obtained her Masters' degree</i>)	62.00

State – Application : Application Received

Application Submission Date : 02/03/2019

Fee Submission Date”

23. It is here that we are reminded of Scott.

24. Scott’s immortal quote from ‘Marmion’ appears, to us, to fit the facts in the present case to a tee. The petitioner, perhaps out of anxiety or perhaps because she had some apprehensions about the first application form filled by her, possibly because she had entered the University from where she obtained her Masters’s degree wrongly, actually ended up filling two applications and submitting them. In the process, she has landed herself in a situation when she can neither disown the first application form nor the second application form, despite her attempts at seeking at the latter both before the Tribunal and before this Court.

25. According to the petitioner, the first application form is hers and the second application form has perhaps been submitted by some unknown person. This assertion is obviously untrue for the following reasons:

(i) The petitioner claims to have applied under Application



No 73984711. This is the Application No. reflected in the first application form, which the petitioner asserts as the one which she had submitted.

(ii) *In that application form, however, the petitioner's Roll No. is reflected as 4500001912. The petitioner has, all along, before the Tribunal as well as before this Court, been contending that her Roll No. was 4500000120.*

(iii) Perhaps by oversight, *para 19 of the writ petition towards its conclusion, acknowledges that the petitioner's Roll No. was in fact 4500001912.* This is contrary to the stand that the petitioner has been adopting throughout before the Tribunal as well as before this Court.

(iv) On this aspect being put to learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, she submitted, on instructions, that perhaps the reference to "4500001912" towards the end of para 19 was a typo and that, in fact, the petitioner's Roll No. was 4500000120.

(v) *However, if the petitioner's Roll No. was 4500000120, she cannot seek to assert the first application form to be hers, as the roll number in that application form is 4500001912. The roll number 4500000120 figures in the second application form which the petitioner seeks to disown.*

(vi) Besides the second application form, which the petitioner



disowns, not only contains the Roll No. 4500000120 but also reflects the petitioner as being the holder of a Masters Degree obtained from IGNOU, Delhi. It is the petitioner's own case that she is the holder of a Masters Degree from IGNOU, Delhi, as is reflected in the very first order dated 22 January 2024 passed by this Court in the present proceedings, para 4 of which reads thus :

“4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the learned Tribunal despite noticing that the two forms purportedly filled by the petitioner did not match, has erroneously disbelieved her plea that she had filled up only one form wherein she had categorically stated that she pursued her M.A. from The Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU).”

(emphasis supplied)

(vii) This submission, made at the Bar, clinches the case against the petitioner. The petitioner submitted that she had filled in “only one form *wherein she had categorically stated that she pursued her M.A. from the IGNOU*”. However, the application form which records the petitioner as having obtained her MA from IGNOU is the second application form, filled in using Amit Gohana's e-mail id and his mobile number, regarding which the petitioner pleads complete ignorance in para 19 of the writ petition and, indeed, all throughout the proceedings till now.

(viii) Thus, the second application form, which the petitioner disowns as having been submitted by some unknown person, *not only contains what she claims to be the correct Roll No. but also her correct educational qualifications. This application*



2025:DHC:1312-DB



form has, however, been submitted using the email ID amitgohana@gmail.com.

(ix) Reverting to the first application form, which the petitioner claims to be the application form which she had submitted, the petitioner is shown, in that application form, to have obtained her Master's Degree in Social Work *from Delhi University, whereas it is the petitioner's own case that she obtained her Master's Degree from IGNOU.* This would also militate against the petitioner's contention that the first application form was the one which she submitted, and the second application form is by some unknown person, without her knowledge.

26. What actually happened, quite obviously, was this:

(i) The petitioner, in fact, submitted two application forms, the first reflecting her email ID as singhpragya211@gmail.com and the second reflecting her email ID as amitgohana@gmail.com. The correct details of the petitioner were entered in the application form submitted using the email ID amitgohana@gmail.com.

(ii) Apparently, what happened was that the petitioner filled in the first application form with incorrect details, including the details of the University from where she had obtained her Master's degree, and, as she could not resubmit the application form with the same phone number and e-mail ID, submitted the



2025:DHC:1312-DB



second application form using the email ID amitgohana@gmail.com and the mobile number 7206814002, both of which she now seeks to disown.

(iii) As a result of her submitting two application forms, two admit cards were generated, one bearing the Roll No. 4500000120 and the other bearing the Roll No. 4500001912.

(iv) The petitioner attempted the examination using the Roll No. 4500000120, which had been generated on the basis of the application submitted by her using Amit Gohana's email ID and mobile number.

(v) Having thus attempted the examination using the Roll No. 4500000120, the petitioner could not thereafter backtrack and claim her Roll No. to be 4500001912. By an inadvertent slip, this fact was disclosed in para 19 of the writ petition, though, all throughout, the petitioner has otherwise been asserting that her Roll No. was 4500000120.

(vi) *In order to avoid the Court or the Tribunal wising to the fact that, in fact, the 4500000120 was the Roll No. generated on the basis of the second application form submitted using the email ID amitgohana@gmail.com and Amit Gohana's mobile number, she concealed, both before the Tribunal as well as before this Court, all documents relating to application, including the application form which she had submitted.*



(vii) Interestingly, while placing on record her Class X mark sheet, the petitioner has conspicuously omitted to place, before the Tribunal as well as before this Court, the certificates relating to her further educational qualifications, particularly her Master's Degree. This was obviously, so that the Court would not know that the petitioner obtain her Master's Degree from the IGNOU, which would completely defeat her case that the first application form, and Roll No. 450000120, were hers. She has also suppressed, from her OA as well as from her writ petition, this fact, i.e., that she had obtained her Master's Degree from IGNOU, making no reference to the said qualification.

(viii) This was obviously because, if the Court were to be informed that the petitioner had obtained her Master's Degree from IGNOU it would defeat her case that she had in fact submitted the first application form and knew nothing about the second application form, for it was in the second application form that her Master's Degree is shown to have been obtained from IGNOU. The first application form reflected the Master's Degree of the petitioner as having been obtained from the Delhi University.

(ix) Unfortunately, however, during oral arguments on the very first day, the petitioner acknowledged before this Court that she had obtained her Master's Degree from IGNOU.

27. We are aware that the petitioner is a young lady, with her life



2025:DHC:1312-DB



ahead of her. We do not wish to use superlatives to express our opinion of what she has done. We merely feel disturbed that, in the process, the Tribunal and, thereafter, this Court, have been led up the garden path. We express our unhappiness, and leave it at that.

28. We refrain from making any further observations in this regard, keeping in mind the future career of the petitioner.

29. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed, without costs.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA, J.

FEBRUARY 28, 2025/yg/aky

Click here to check corrigendum, if any