



\$~12

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

***Date of decision: 18.11.2024***

+ W.P.(C) 4087/2022 & CM APPL. 12180/2022  
MONU SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Ankur Chhibber,  
Mr.Anshuman Mehrotra,  
Mr.Arjun Panwar, Mr.Amrit  
Koul, Mr.Nikunj Arora and  
Ms.Muskaan Dutta, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Anshuman, SPC with  
Mr.Hemendra Singh, Dy.  
Comdt., BSF

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINDER KAUR**

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (Oral)**

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner challenging the rejection slip dated 24.11.2021 and 09.12.2021 issued by the respondents, rejecting the candidature/application of the petitioner for recruitment to the post of Constable (Crew) under the detailed notice for recruitment to the posts of SI (Master)/SI (Workshop)/SI (Engine Driver)/HC (Master)/HC (Engine Driver)/HC (Workshop)/CT(Crew) in Water Wing of BSF by Direct Recruitment Examination-2020 on the ground that “*Experience Certificate of different firm for different dates.*”



2. The petitioner had applied for recruitment to the post of Constable (Crew) in the Water Wing of the BSF pursuant to the above mentioned advertisement. The pre-requisite for appointment to the said post was as under:

- “i) Matriculation from a recognized board or equivalent and;*
- ii) one year experience in operation of Boat below 265 HP and;*
- iii) Should know swimming in deep water without any assistance and will submit an undertaking certificate as per Annexure- 'D-1' alongwith Application Form.”*

3. The Paragraph 15(f) of the advertisement required the candidates to upload the experience certificate as a proof of experience.

4. The petitioner, along with his application form, admittedly, uploaded the certificate dated 31.08.2015 issued by Heritage River Cruises Pvt. Ltd. The learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the fact that this certificate did not meet the eligibility criteria as mentioned in the advertisement.

5. The petitioner cleared the written examination and was called for the documentation, PST and PET examination, on 16.11.2021. At the time of scrutiny of his documents, it was found that the experience certificate uploaded by him with his application form did not meet the eligibility criteria.

6. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner was given an opportunity to produce a further certificate, if he possesses one, and based on this exemption, the petitioner then produced a certificate dated 03.01.2019 issued by M.V. Mahaprobhu, which, according to



the petitioner, meets the eligibility criteria.

7. The respondents, however, due to a discrepancy in the two certificates, rejected the candidature of the petitioner.

8. The representations of the petitioner against the rejection were also rejected *vide* impugned rejection slip dated 24.11.2021 and 09.12.2021, forcing the petitioner to approach this Court by way of the present petition.

9. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that for a minor discrepancy and a mistake in uploading the correct certificate, the candidature of the petitioner should not have been rejected by the respondents. He submits that recruitment process was still at the document verification stage, and the respondents could have very well verified the genuineness of the new experience certificate that was produced by the petitioner. He submits that the candidature of the petitioner, therefore, could not have been rejected on a minor mistake committed by the petitioner in uploading his experience certificate at the time of filling up the application form.

10. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondents submits that it is only the experience certificate which is uploaded along with the application form that can be considered by the respondents.

11. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties.

12. The petitioner has not disputed that the experience certificate that was uploaded by him along with this application, did not meet the eligibility criteria. The new certificate that the petitioner sought to



produce before the respondents could not be taken cognizance of and, therefore, the candidature of the petitioner was rightly rejected by the competent authority of the respondents.

13. We are of the opinion that the advertisement clearly spelt out the requirements for the post, including the experience. It also required the candidates to upload their experience certificate at the time of filling up the application form. The document verification stage is for verifying the documents that have been so uploaded by the petitioner. The petitioner at that stage cannot produce new documents to claim his eligibility. Though, it may seem to be a minor infraction by the petitioner in not uploading the correct experience certificate, we cannot lose sight of the fact that there may be other candidates who may have been rejected, and in fact, we have been informed that other candidates were rejected on this ground of discrepancy, or even would not have applied as they did not possess the requisite experience certificate on the date of their application. Giving relief to the petitioner would be doing injustice to these candidates.

14. We, therefore, find no merit in the present petition. The same is accordingly dismissed.

15. The pending application also stands dismissed.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**SHALINDER KAUR, J**

**NOVEMBER 18, 2024/sg/VS**

*Click here to check corrigendum, if any*