



Delhi Development Authority
Personnel Branch-V, Room No. B-709,
Vikas Sadan, INA New Delhi-110023

F3(01)2020/PB-V/Misc./DDA/110

Date: 02.06.2026

DDA issued Notice No. F3(01)2020/PB-V/Misc./DDA/68 dated 30.05.2025 inviting revised affidavits/applications from eligible dependents of deceased DDA employees and employees retired on medical grounds for consideration against 93 vacancies available up to 31.12.2024 under the 5% compassionate appointment quota for the posts of MTS and Mali.

2. In reference to aforementioned notice, applications were called from the dependents of the deceased employee against 93 vacancies available up to 31.12.2024 under the 5% compassionate appointment quota for the posts of MTS and Mali. In pursuance of the aforementioned notice a total of 504 revised affidavits were received on or before the prescribed closing date i.e. 01.09.2025.

3. The applications received within the prescribed time period were examined and classified as under:

a. List 1 - Cases falling within the Zone of Consideration requiring normal document verification (163 candidates) - These candidates in number) fall within the Zone of Consideration. Their candidature shall remain provisional and subject to normal document verification, eligibility under the applicable recruitment rules, medical fitness, character and antecedents verification, and fulfilment of all other prescribed formalities. **Their list is annexed as Annexure 1.**

b. List 2 — Cases falling within the Zone of Consideration requiring specific document/ record verification (47 candidates) – These candidates also fall provisionally within the Zone of Consideration. However, their candidature shall remain subject to fulfilment or verification of the specific document/record requirement mentioned against their respective names, in addition to normal document verification, eligibility under the applicable recruitment rules, medical fitness, character and antecedents verification, and fulfilment of all other prescribed formalities. **Their list is annexed as Annexure 2.**

c. **List 3 – Ineligible/ Rejected cases (294 candidates)** – These candidates have been found ineligible/ rejected. These cases do not fall within the Zone of Consideration and have not been awarded marks under the MoHUA 100-point formula. Further, the 8 applications received after the due date (upto 12.02.2026) were not included in scrutiny and were treated as rejected/ time-barred in terms of the Notice dated 30.05.2025. The relevant ground of ineligibility/rejection has been recorded against each case. **Their list is annexed as Annexure 3.**

4. Candidates provisionally shortlisted under both List 1 and List 2 are granted three weeks (until 23.06.2026) to prepare the documents required for verification. This opportunity will be limited only for verification of existing declarations/documents and not to introduce a fresh claim or otherwise improve the application after the last date. Document verification will be held on 24.06.2026 and 25.06.2026 at Nagrik Suvidha Kendra, D- Block, ground floor, Vikas Sadan, Delhi Development Authority, INA, New Delhi – 110023. List of documents required for document verification is annexed as **Annexure 4.**

5. It is also clarified that List 1 and List 2 are for the purpose of further processing provisionally eligible cases against the 93 available vacancies and is not a final merit list, waiting list, select list or order of appointment. The final list for offer of appointment against the 93 available vacancies shall thereafter be prepared in order of merit from amongst the candidates who remain eligible after verification, subject to medical fitness, character and antecedents verification, compliance with the applicable recruitment rules, and fulfilment of all other prescribed conditions. If, at any stage, it is found that a candidate has provided false information, suppressed material facts, submitted fabricated documents, failed to provide required documentation or if a fair assessment of the claim cannot be made, the application shall be liable to rejection.

6. A period of 10 days (until 12.06.2026) is granted for submitting any representations. This opportunity is not to introduce a fresh claim or otherwise improve the application. Representation, if any, should be addressed to Dy. Director (P)-V and submitted at Counter No. 5, ground floor, D-Block, Vikas Sadan, Delhi Development Authority, INA, New Delhi – 110023.

This issues with the approval of Competent Authority

Deep
21/6/26
(Deepanker Gupta)
Director (P)-II

Consideration Zone					
S. No.	RAF	Name of Deceased/ Designation	Name of Applicant	DOB of Applicant	Category SC/ ST/ OBC /Gen.
1	284	Mukesh Kumar S/G	Aakash Kumar	26-03-2001	SC
2	277	Dharmveer Singh Beldar	Ajay Kumar	01-12-1987	SC
3	444	Chander Mani Kundra A.E.	Akash Kundra	14-08-1990	Gen
4	46	Karam Singh Beldar	Akshit Choudhary	07-02-2003	OBC
5	321	Ram Sumer Beldar	Amarjeet	15-02-1986	SC
6	34	Munesh S/G	Amit	15-10-1986	Gen
7	206	Prem Singh S/G	Amit Kumar	25-09-1993	OBC
8	433	Satbir Singh S/G	Amit Yadav	06-09-1992	OBC
9	102	Prem Prakash Beldar	Anil Kumar	18-04-1988	SC
10	7	Gulshan Kumar Khallasi	Ankit Anand	06-12-2000	Gen
11	182	Ram Kumar Bhati S/G	Annu Bhati	20-03-2001	OBC
12	456	Surender Pal Tomar S/G	Anuj Tomar	18-06-1990	Gen (Jat)
13	23	Bijender Singh Mali	Arun Kumar	10-05-1995	Gen (Jat)
14	123	Ram Chandra Singh Beldar	Arun Kumar	20-05-1986	SC
15	349	Surender Singh Pump Operator	Arun Yadav	24-06-1995	OBC
16	59	Padam Kumar Sharma S/G	Ashish Giri	10-06-1999	Gen
17	16	Maan Singh Mali	Ashish Kharb	28-03-1994	Gen (Jat)
18	61	Sher Ram Programmer	Ashish Kumar	30-06-1992	Gen
19	87	Pritam Singh OCM	Ashish Kumar	03-03-1996	SC
20	77	Chinpai Mali	Ashok Kumar	21-01-1989	UR
21	264	Mahavir Parsad Peon	Asmohan	14-06-1988	SC
22	44	Vijay Kumar Drafts Man Gr-II	Ayush	07-03-2002	Gen
23	241	Beer Singh Mali	Balram	15-12-1993	OBC

24	180	Rishi Pal Bhadana Pump Operator	Bharat	10-05-1996	OBC
25	299	Amrit Lal Gupta Beldar	Bhupender Kumar Gupta	01-03-1994	Gen
26	237	Ram Prasad Mali	Bhupender Singh	02-03-1998	SC
27	144	ShyamVeer Singh Mali	Bittu	02-04-1992	OBC
28	484	Mahendra Kumar Meena	Chhagan Lal Meena	21-05-1990	ST
29	67	Ramji Lal Beldar	Deepak	01-10-1994	Gen
30	26	Lekh Ram S/G	Deepak Kumar	25-12-1991	OBC
31	53	Mahavir Pump Operator (PWO (W/CR))	Deepak Kumar	27-09-1985	Gen
32	442	Chandra Dev Mali	Deepak Kumar	12-06-1996	SC
33	83	Sanjay Shokeen JSA	Deepak Shokeen	26-05-1993	Gen
34	380	Shri Chand Khallasi	Deepak Thakur	27-11-1987	OBC
35	319	Jai Prakash Sharma S/G	Devender Sharma	15-08-1994	Gen
36	342	Randhir Singh Beldar	Devinder Kumar	07-07-1996	OBC
37	151	Sukhbir Mali	Dhani	09-04-1998	SC
38	295	Rajesh Tiwari J. E	Dhruv Tiwari	18-11-1990	Gen
39	405	Ramesh Chandra Peon	Divya Kumar	29-01-1995	SC
40	86	Sonbir Singh Khallasi	Gaurav Sen	08-01-1995	OBC
41	116	Mool Chand Sharma S/G	Gourav Kumar	11-05-1998	Gen
42	243	Rajinder Singh UDC	Gursharan Singh	12-05-1987	Gen
43	307	Mange Ram G. O.	Gyan Singh	13-07-1989	OBC
44	445	Jaipal Singh Mali	Harendra Singh	03-02-1988	Gen
45	105	Tejender Singh Wire Man	Harpreet Singh	18-09-1991	SC
46	107	Chand Singh Mali	Hemant	10-06-1994	OBC
47	119	Karan Dutt Mate W/C R	Himanshi	17-11-2000	OBC

48	194	Devender Singh Khallasi	Himanshu Singh	19-04-1991	Gen
49	56	Somnath Mali	Inderjeet	24-09-1993	SC
50	244	Pratap Singh Bora LDC	Isvar Singh	25-11-1993	Gen
51	437	Dharampal S/G	Jagmohan	21-12-1993	OBC
52	37	Amar Singh Mali	Jai Prakash	27-09-1988	SC
53	214	Ram Swaroop Mali	Jai Prakash Sankla	11-07-1988	SC
54	65	Balraj S/G	Jay Sri	30-08-1974	OBC
55	424	Rati Ram Beldar	Jaymeshwar	01-01-1982	SC
56	494	Ivon Massey Khallasi	Jonathan Massey	03-07-1996	Gen
57	18	Jonny Beldar	Jyoti	04-04-1992	Gen
58	1	Rajkumar Mali	Kajal	05-05-2002	SC
59	8	Govind Driver	Kamal	29-08-1995	SC
60	288	Vijay Pal Mali	Kamar Pal	10-07-1992	SC
61	60	Naresh Kumar S/G	Kapil	08-08-1986	Gen
62	476	Keshav Ram S/G	Kapil Bhati	20-07-1994	Gen
63	223	Amar Singh Mali	Kapil Kumar	20-07-1989	OBC
64	70	BegRaj Mali	Karam Veer Singh	11-10-1992	OBC
65	136	Jai Bhagwan Mali	Kavita Gulliya	29-01-1999	Gen
66	406	Lal Bahadur S/G	Kuldeep	01-04-1990	Gen
67	274	Surender Pal Singh Mali	Lakhan Singh	10-07-1993	SC
68	187	Surender Pal Singh UDC	Lalit Dhankar	28-06-1990	Gen
69	222	Subhash Chand Beldar	Mahesh Kumar	01-07-1997	OBC
70	168	Dhan Singh S/G	Mahipal Singh	17-11-1993	Gen
71	271	ManMohan S/G	Mamta	08-08-1986	Gen
72	312	Ram Lal Mali	Mamta	12-03-1997	SC

73	350	Raj Kumar Sharma S/G	Mamta Sharma	21-02-1989	Gen
74	42	Narayan Mali	Mangal Rao	07-12-1982	SC
75	157	Dalip Kumar Lift Operator	Manish Kumar	20-09-1987	SC
76	131	Lakhi Ram S/G	Manoj	04-10-1996	OBC
77	491	Sandeep Kumar S/G	Mayank Dabas	03-06-2006	OBC
78	80	Ashok Gulia S/G	Meena	31-07-1989	Gen
79	471	Raj Dev Prasad Mali	Mithlesh	11-08-1996	OBC
80	78	Riyazuddin Mali	Mohd. Ahasan	02-06-1988	OBC
81	411	Thakur Singh Mali	Monika	05-03-1990	Gen
82	6	Kishan Gopal Beldar	Mukesh Malhotra	11-08-1991	Gen
83	9	Ram Singh Mali	Munesh	11-03-1983	SC
84	3	Manjeet Sharma S./G.	Muskan	28-09-2002	Gen
85	154	Thakur Dass OCM	Muskan Khatri	01-10-1999	Gen
86	323	Chhote Lal Fitter	Naresh	31-05-1993	SC
87	290	Ram Kumar S/G	Naveen Kumar	09-01-1990	OBC
88	231	Jai Bhagwan Panwar S/G	Neeraj Panwar	02-07-1987	Gen (Jat)
89	400	Suresh Kumar Sweeper	Neetu	05-03-1996	SC
90	227	Jeevan Dass Peon	Nidhi Mahendiratta	15-07-2000	Gen
91	253	Ram Avtar Peon	Nikalank	28-06-1999	SC
92	71	Satender Mali	Nikhil Dagar	27-10-1995	Gen
93	315	Ram Kumar Khallasi	Niru	28-11-1996	Gen
94	63	Gaya Prasad S/G	Nishant Bhardwaj	15-07-2000	Gen
95	117	Padam Singh S/G	Nitin Kumar	20-12-1986	OBC
96	91	Mohd. Jamil Mali	Oli Alam	12-11-1995	Gen
97	38	Basanta Beldar	Om Prakash	20-03-1985	SC

98	259	Ram Chander Mali	Ombeer	16-07-1994	SC
99	374	Palani Beldar	P. Ravi Kumar	31-12-1991	OBC
100	152	Ashok Kumar Staff Car Driver	Pankaj Sharma	01-05-1993	Gen
101	47	Baljit Singh Beldar	Pardeep	20-07-1999	Gen
102	368	Mahendra Singh Peon	Parmod Kumar	09-10-1991	OBC
103	121	Ram Lal Mali	Parwati	05-02-1973	Gen
104	289	Tejpal Mali	Pawan Kumar	15-08-1990	OBC
105	73	Durga Dass JSA	Pawan Kumar Aloria	04-04-1986	SC
106	457	Sudama Yadav S/G	Pawan Kumar Yadav	21-11-1989	OBC
107	273	Satya Prakash S/G	Pawan Prakash	21-08-1987	Gen
108	204	Uday Raj Khallasi	Poonam Kumari	23-04-1997	OBC
109	115	Raj Kumar Fitter	Prasant Kumar	10-12-1990	Gen
110	396	RamSwaroop Mali	Praveen Kumar	04-01-1985	SC
111	34	Ashok Kumar OCM	Prem Yadav	05-01-1991	OBC
112	90	Lal Bahadur Fitter	Prince Chauhan	10-08-1993	Gen
113	150	Naresh Kumar S/G	Puneet Kumar	14-09-1989	Gen
114	156	Sabad Singh Mali	Pushkar	31-03-1988	SC
115	113	Rajpal Mali	Rahul	31-05-1992	OBC
116	372	Om Prakash S/G	Rahul	07-11-1991	OBC
117	97	Ram Dulare Mali	Rahul	08-07-1998	OBC
118	198	Inder Pal Mali	Rahul Pavar	01-01-1995	Gen (Jat)
119	33	Mukesh Kumar Sharma S.S.A.	Rahul Sharma	16-12-1992	Gen
120	397	Bharam Singh Mali	Raj Kumar	06-10-1990	SC
121	66	Braham Pal Sweepar	Raja	31-12-1998	SC
122	36	Jai Shree Beldar	Ravi	26-01-1996	Gen

123	475	Lekhram Beldar	Ravi	05-02-1990	SC
124	354	Shyam Sunder Peon	Reena	04-02-1988	Gen
125	92	Rameshwar Dayal UDC	Rekha Rani	08-06-1988	SC
126	49	Jaypal Singh Ex-Sewer Man	Renu	06-04-1981	SC
127	334	Narender Kumar Beldar	Rohit Kumar	01-10-1989	SC
128	375	Vinish Kumar JSA	Rupwali Kumar	18-12-1996	Gen
129	177	Ram Babu Khallasi	Sachin Morya	17-07-1989	SC
130	22	Satpal Mali	Sagar	30-05-2004	OBC
131	82	Ramesh Kumar Beldar	Sandeep	10-08-2002	Gen
132	316	Jug Raj Mali	Sanjay Kumar Pankaj	12-08-1982	SC
133	24	Charan Dass Mali	Sanjeev Kumar	13-03-1981	SC
134	276	Charan Singh Mali	Sarvan Kumar	10-03-1996	Gen
135	62	Hari Chand S/G	Seema	20-04-1998	Gen (Jat)
136	145	Ugra Narayan Mishra Beldar	Shambhu Kumar Mishra	12-12-1992	Gen
137	85	Manjeet Singh Hd. Mali	Sheetal	30-11-1984	SC
138	209	Jai Kishan Mali	Shiv Kumar	15-06-1992	OBC
139	381	Ompal Wireman	Shiv Kumar	10-10-2003	Gen
140	111	Chander Bhan J. E.	Shubham	29-07-2002	OBC
141	64	Nageshwar Dayal Goel Asistent	Sneha Goel	25-09-1988	Gen
142	371	Ram Udar Mahto Mali	Sudhir Kumar	09-09-1992	OBC
143	489	Shankar Prasad	Sumit Kumar	08-09-1990	SC
144	310	Hira Lal S/G	Sumitra Devi	05-06-1970	SC
145	337	Bhram Prakash S/G	Surender	26-06-1988	OBC
146	25	Pawan Kumar Sadwal S/G	Sushil Kumar	25-01-1997	Gen
147	41	Satish Kumar Mali	Tarun	25-04-2005	SC

148	473	Ratan Singh Beldar	Tej Pratap	19-03-1998	Gen
149	358	Om Prakash Mali	Tushant Saini	04-12-1992	OBC
150	124	Mohd. Abbas Ali B.C.D (W/C)R	Umar Farukh	10-12-1997	Gen (Jat)
151	120	Jagdish OCM	Umesh	31-05-1993	Gen
152	389	Sunil Kumar Sharma J. E	Varun Kumar Sharma	16-06-1989	Gen
153	322	Sukhbir Singh Peon	Vatan Singh	20-10-1987	Gen (Jat)
154	234	Udai Kant Mali	Vicky Kumar Jha	01-05-1995	Gen
155	143	Ramesh Chander Jr. Modelor W/C	Vijay Jangra	15-07-1990	OBC
156	268	Parasram Mali	Vikal Bidhuri	19-02-1994	Gen
157	215	Raj Pal Beldar	Vikas Kumar	21-02-1993	OBC
158	203	Satbir Singh Pump Operator	Vikash Panwar	23-07-1988	Gen
159	171	Krishan Kumar A. D.	Vineet Kumar	02-12-1993	SC
160	425	Kapil Kumar Saini Beldar	Vineet Saini	12-04-1994	Gen
161	233	Niwas Sharma Khallasi	Vipin Sharma	05-03-1995	Gen
162	272	Mitra Pal Singh Khallasi	Vivek Kumar	19-10-1999	Gen
163	218	Brahamjeet Mali	Yograj	11-07-1984	OBC

Sd/-

Subject to Condition/ Specific Documents/ Record Verification						
S. No.	RAF	Name of Deceased/ Designation	Name of Applicant	DOB of Applicant	Category SC/ ST/ OBC /Gen.	Subject To
1	408	Joginder Singh S/G	Ajay	22-08-1994	Gen	Subject to the submission of clarification regarding typographical error in the NOC signed by Ms. Annu and status & valuation of the residential property and the agricultural property separately, as on 31.05.2025.
2	72	Ram Sikil S/G	Ajeet Kumar	01-01-1988	Gen	Subject to factual verification through welfare inspection regarding the employment status of the applicant and his brother, and the applicant's dependency on his brother.
3	487	Shiv Prasad Yadav Mali	Ajeet Yadav	07-07-2002	OBC	The applicant shall submit ownership proof/ status of property at Khanpur, Delhi
4	393	Nawab Jan Beldar	Ali Mohd.	02-01-1992	Gen	Subject to the factual verification through welfare inspection including verifying the means of subsistence of family
5	503	Suresh Chand S/G	Atul	15-02-1995	SC	Subject to the submission regarding the typographical error in the NOC signed by Sh. Dinesh and Ms. Sushma (dependents of the deceased employee) and submission of Aadhar details of the widow
6	428	Bhoop Singh Mali	Deepak	03-03-1989	OBC	The applicant shall submit the status and valuation of the residential property and the agricultural property separately, as of 31.05.2025 and marital status with proof for Ms. Meenu and Ms. Reenu on the date of death of deceased employee.
7	212	Shiv Kumar Sharma Mali	Deepak Sharma	15-08-1989	Gen	The applicant shall submit the status and valuation of the residential property and the agricultural property separately, as of 31.05.2025.
8	118	Satya Singh S/G	Dinesh Singh	10-06-1993	Gen	The applicant shall submit life certificate/ survivor certificate in respect of Smt. Rikhooli Devi
9	248	Rameshwar Khallasi	Gaurav Kumar	05-07-1994	SC	The applicant shall submit the current status of Ms. Sarla as well as the marital status of Ms. Sarla on the date of death of deceased employee
10	429	Veer Pal S/G	Gayatri	20-05-1995	SC	The applicant shall submit ownership proof/ sale deed documents of property at Ganga Vihar, Delhi to corroborate the statement made by the applicant in the affidavit
11	40	Gajraj Safai Karamchari	Hari Kumar	02-04-1993	SC	The applicant is required to submit details regarding the present status of Ms. Poonam, Ms. Roopa, and Ms. Priyanka, along with their marital status as on the date of death of the deceased employee.
12	45	Jagnnathan Beldar	J. Shekhar	16-08-1989	Gen	The applicant is required to submit details regarding the present status of Ms. Jyoti and Ms. Joteshwari, along with their marital status as on the date of death of the deceased employee.
13	472	Lal Chand S/G	Jitendra Kumar	06-06-1984	SC	The applicant shall submit the marital status of two of family members namely Ms. Sunita and Ms. Santosh on the date of death of deceased employee. Further subject to the factual verification through welfare inspection including verifying the means of subsistence of family
14	14	Kanti Kumar Khallasi	Kapil Kumar Verma	10-10-1990	OBC	The applicant is required to submit details regarding the present status of Ms. Yogita, along with her marital status as on the date of death of the deceased employee.
15	242	Kanwar Singh Daftari	Lalit Kumar	01-07-1987	SC	Subject to factual verification through welfare inspection regarding the applicant's claim of nil family income, despite the applicant's brother reportedly being engaged as a daily wagger.

16	239	R. Muthu Driver	M. Anand	15-03-1993	SC	The applicant is required to submit proof of ownership in respect of the property situated at C-64, Rampura, Delhi as on 31.05.2025, and also clarify the present status of the said property.
17	17	Sukhbir Singh Mali	Mahesh Nagar	25-06-1998	OBC	The applicant shall submit valid identification proof of the dependent(s) in support of the particulars furnished in the application.
18	250	Rameshwar Prasad Mate	Man Mohan	25-02-1990	Gen	The applicant shall submit the current status of Ms. Manju as well as the marital status of Ms. Manju on the date of death of deceased employee
19	101	Meer Singh Messon	Monu	05-11-1985	OBC	Subject to factual verification through welfare inspection, including verification of the family's means of subsistence, based on the applicant's declaration that family members are unemployed, total family income is nil and that no family pension is being received.
20	68	Sudershan Sharma Mali	Mukesh Sharma	03-03-1998	Gen	The applicant shall intimate and clarify the status of the family member namely, Ms. Jainti, whose name appeared in the Nomination Form submitted by the deceased employee during his lifetime and also clarify her marital status on the date of death of deceased employee.
21	29	Indra Wati Coolie	Neeraj Kumar	09-09-1990	SC	Subject to factual verification through welfare inspection, including verification of the family's means of subsistence, based on the applicant's declaration that family members are unemployed, total family income is nil and that no family pension is being received.
22	89	Rajeshwar Dutt Mate	Nishant Vats	20-06-1991	Gen	Subject to the authenticity and genuineness of the representation received from Sh. Ajay Kumar, brother of the applicant, stating that the NOC purportedly submitted on his behalf had not been signed by him.
23	52	Sukhpal Singh Khallasi	Omkar	29-08-1994	SC	The applicant shall submit bank statement covering the crucial date of 31.05.2025, in support of the financial declaration made in the affidavit and verification through welfare inspection including verifying the means of subsistence of family
24	495	Prem Bahadur Mali	Parwati	31-10-1992	Gen	The applicant shall submit ownership proof/ status of property at sector 43, Noida.
25	417	Raj Pal Beldar	Pawan Kumar	18-02-1988	Gen (Jat)	The applicant shall submit the status and valuation of the residential property and the agricultural property separately, as of 31.05.2025.
26	344	Subhash Chand Chowkidar	Praveen Kumar	17-07-1985	OBC	The applicant shall submit the status and valuation of the residential property and the agricultural property separately, as of 31.05.2025.
27	104	Nar Singh Mali	Preeti	12-03-1987	Gen	The applicant is required to submit proof of ownership in respect of the property situated at Kulasi, Jhajjar, as on 31.05.2025, along with the death certificate of her husband in support of the declaration furnished in the affidavit.
28	99	Karambir Singh Khallasi	Priyanka	25-07-1993	SC	The applicant is required to furnish her marriage certificate and clarify the status of the family member, namely Sh. Yogesh, whose name appears in the ration card.
29	109	Charan Singh Environment Asstt.	Puneet Kumar	24-02-1999	SC	The applicant is required to submit details regarding the present status of Ms. Poonam, along with her marital status as on the date of death of the deceased employee. Further, factual verification through a welfare inspection, including verification of the means of subsistence of the family, shall also be conducted.
30	32	Kartik Shah Beldar	Purnima	01-01-1987	SC	The applicant shall submit valid identification proof of the dependent(s) in support of the particulars furnished in the application.

31	126	Dharam Singh Mali	Rajni	08-04-1999	SC	The applicant is required to submit proof of ownership in respect of the property situated at Akbarpur Majra as on 31.05.2025, and also clarify the present status of the said property.
32	221	Ramesh Chand Peon	Rajni	08-07-1988	SC	Subject to the verification of residential and correspondence address of the applicant which are stated to be a rental jhuggi
33	192	Phire Ram Chokidar	Rajvati	01-01-1972	Gen	Subject to factual verification through welfare inspection regarding the applicant's claim of nil family income, despite the applicant's brother being employed as a labourer with Indian Oil Corporation Limited.
34	465	Om Prakash Mali	Ravindra Kumar	03-04-1991	OBC	The applicant shall submit the status and valuation of the residential property and the agricultural property separately, as of 31.05.2025.
35	103	Deen Dayal Meena SSA	Rekha	11-06-1984	ST	The applicant shall submit valid identification proof in respect of deceased employee's father and mother in support of the particulars furnished in the application and affidavit.
36	419	Inder Lal Mali	Sandeep Yadav	18-03-1989	Gen	Subject to the ownership proof/ status of the property situated at House no 557, Bhalaswa Gaon. For the share of widow and dependent family members
37	98	Ram Dhiraj Mali	Sanju Kumar Pal	25-11-1999	OBC	The applicant shall intimate and clarify the status of the family member namely, Ms. Sangita, whose name appears in the Nomination Form submitted by the deceased employee during his lifetime and her marital status on the date of death of deceased employee.
38	427	Nand Kishore Peon	Shilender Kumar	10-06-1988	Gen	The applicant shall submit ownership proof/ sale deed documents of protery at Ballabgarh, Haryana to corroborate the statement made by the applicant in the affidavit
39	351	Suraj Mal S/G	Som Nath	14-05-1984	SC	Subject to the factual verification through welfare inspection including verifying the means of subsistence of family and submission of bank statement for the crucial date of 31.05.2025
40	79	Bhikki Singh Mali	Sudhir Kumar	10-07-1997	Gen	The applicant shall submit the status and valuation of the residential property and the agricultural property separately, as of 31.05.2025.
41	496	Ratani Coolie	Sunil Kumar	08-05-1986	SC	Subject to factual verification through welfare inspection, including verification of the family's means of subsistence. Further, the applicant shall submit the employment status of Sh. Sonu Kumar and details regarding the applicant's dependency on Sh. Sonu Kumar.
42	356	Sundar Beldar	Ujjwal	03-10-1996	OBC	The applicant shall submit the status and valuation of the residential property and the agricultural property separately, as of 31.05.2025.
43	392	Rana Pratap Singh Mali	Uttam Prasad Singh	26-10-1996	Gen	The applicant shall submit the status and valuation of the residential property and the agricultural property separately, as of 31.05.2025.
44	398	Bijender S/G	Vinay	03-06-1994	Gen	The applicant shall submit the status and valuation of the residential property and the agricultural property separately, as of 31.05.2025.
45	219	Kanti Prasad Tyagi	Vineet Kumar Tyagi	10-10-1996	Gen	Subject to the submission of clarification regarding typographical error in the documents related to property.
46	267	Dhir Singh S/G	Vishal Kumar	12-04-1983	OBC	Subject to the factual verification through welfare inspection including verifying the means of subsistence of family and submission of bank statement for the crucial date of 31.05.2025

47	48	Santosh Devi Sr. Mali	Yogesh Kumar	10-12-1998	Gen	Subject to factual verification through welfare inspection, including verification of the family's means of subsistence, based on the applicant's declaration that family members are unemployed, total family income is nil and that no family pension is being received.
----	----	--------------------------	--------------	------------	-----	--

Sd/-

Rejection Zone					
S. No.	RAF	Name of Deceased/ Designation	Name of Applicant	DOB of Applicant	Reason for Ineligibility/ Rejection
1	335	Attar Singh Mali	Aakash	29-12-1997	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
2	195	Matiullah S/G	Aamir Ansari	01-01-1994	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 8 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 4 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
3	88	Naresh Nagpal Mali	Aarti Nagpal	04-08-1997	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds of incomplete disclosure. As per the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 28.02.2014, the family owns a residential property bearing No. 78, Tandel Mohalla, Meerut Cantt. U.P. area measuring 80 Sq.Yds., with widow share 1/2. However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has not provided the current status of this property. This omission formed the basis for rejection of the case.
4	486	Subhash Dhama Mate	Abhay Dhama	16-08-1991	The committee rejected the case as there was discrepancy in the dependence status of applicant's grandmother at the time of death of deceased official. In his 2019 affidavit the applicant stated that his grandmother was dependent on the deceased official while in 2025 affidavit she is shown as not dependent at the time of death of deceased official however she was shown as dependent as on 31.05.2025. Furthermore no NOC as required was received from the applicant's grandmother.
5	383	Duli Chand Pump Operator	Aditi	09-04-1998	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
6	412	Hari Shankar Mali	Ajay	01-07-1992	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
7	112	Vinod Kumar	Akash Kumar	04-07-1996	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed education qualification criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025
8	390	Har Prasad Singh S/G	Akash Saini	19-06-1995	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 15 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 3 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
9	183	Jai Pal Mate	Amit Kumar	22-12-1982	The Committee rejected the case due to multiple discrepancies and inconsistencies observed in the documents submitted. In the 2025 affidavit, Ms. Anjali, the applicant's sister, has been declared as unmarried; however, in the 2019 affidavit, she was recorded as married. This contradiction is further substantiated by the Aadhaar card attached with the 2025 affidavit, wherein she is mentioned as "W/o Neeraj Kumar.". Additionally, there is a discrepancy in the declared valuation of the subject property. The applicant reported the property value as ₹7 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, whereas in the 2025 affidavit, it has been reduced to ₹5.06 lakh without any supporting justification.
10	304	Rajesh Kumar S/G	Amit Kumar	28-08-1982	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
11	387	Madan Lal Khallasi	Amit Kumar	28-12-1980	The committee rejected the case as death occurring after compulsory retirement renders the dependents ineligible under the DoPT provisions of compassionate appointment
12	15	Madan Pal Singh S/G	Amit Singh	03-11-1982	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
13	230	Hari Ram Mali	Amit Tomar	10-04-2000	The Committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at ₹9 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower value of ₹3 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of any documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosures lack financial credibility.

14	297	Mohd. Naim S/G	Amreen	16-04-1998	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, according to the 2019 affidavit, the applicant resided at Property No. 195, Gali No. 04, Jyoti Nagar, Rishi Kardampuri, Delhi, valued at Rs. 6.5 lakh, but the current affidavit does not clarify the status of this property, i.e., whether it has been sold or not. Instead, the applicant claims to be living on rent at another property while providing a nil property valuation. Additionally, the required rent receipts were not submitted along with the rent agreement.
15	434	Triveni Prasad Mali	Anil Kumar	02-04-1987	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 3 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
16	179	Azad Khallasi	Anil Kumar Paingwal	16-10-1996	The Screening Committee rejected the case due to multiple discrepancies and deficiencies in the documents submitted. The applicant's 2019 affidavit and original 10th-grade certificate both record a Date of Birth (DoB) of 16.10.1982. This is further corroborated by a 1996 nomination form, which lists the applicant as 14 years old as of 07.10.1996. However, the applicant has now submitted a conflicting 10th-grade certificate with a DoB of 16.10.1996. As the applicant is clearly reflected in official records prior to 16.10.1996, this discrepancy establishes that false information has been provided. Additionally, the current affidavit submitted by the applicant is unsigned. While a No Objection Certificate (NOC) from Sh. Arun Kumar was provided in the 2019 affidavit, no such NOC has been submitted with the current affidavit.
17	178	Moli S/G	Anish	03-04-1994	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that as per the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant stated that he is residing as a guest at property No. D-449, Shaheed Nagar, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, which is stated to be owned by his maternal uncle. However, the applicant submitted property documents in favour of Sadakat (maternal uncle) pertaining to property No. D-295, Shaheed Nagar, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, and failed to furnish any supporting documents in respect of property No. D-449 to establish that the said property belongs to his relative. Further, as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 30.01.2014, the family owns a property measuring 80 sq. yds. bearing House No. D-449, Shaheed Nagar, Ghaziabad, with the widow having a 100% share in the property. Moreover, the applicant declared that the family was not receiving any pension; however, records reveal that a basic family pension of Rs. 9,000 per month is being received.
18	188	Surender Kumar Beldar	Anit	16-06-1999	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's residential address has been reported as H. No. 12 village budhapur, Delhi-36 in the affidavit, whereas the rent agreement reflects a different address, i.e. H. No. 26 village Budhapur, Delhi-36, further, the status of the property at House no 12 as declared in the affidavit has not been clarified, thereby rendering the submission inconsistent and incomplete.
19	483	Raj Kumar Director	Anju	30-06-1969	The committee rejected the case due to the observations that property bearing No. 7/137, declared in the 2019 affidavit with a valuation of Rs. 5,83,333/- (1/6th share of Rs. 35 lakh), was not mentioned in the current affidavit, with no clarification as to whether it is still in possession or has been sold. Additionally, although the applicant declared residing in rented accommodation, the rent agreement lacks the signatures of both parties, and the rent receipts are signed by the applicant instead of the owner.
20	246	Shri Chand Kasana Mate	Ankit Kasana	10-06-1997	The Committee has rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant failed to submit the affidavit in the prescribed format. Furthermore, the disclosure provided was found to be incomplete, lacking the requisite details for a proper evaluation.

21	467	Kalingan Mali	Anna Durai	09-11-1988	In the 2019 affidavit, the applicant declared a property at Inderpuri, Delhi with a valuation of Rs. 3 lakh. However, in the current affidavit, the same property is shown as rented accommodation. Although the applicant had stated that the property was sold however no supporting documents/ financial transaction proof was provided neither the sale value was declared in the affidavit as required.
22	415	Rakesh Singh Mali	Anuj Kumar	03-09-1994	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property in Uttam Nagar, valued at Rs. 12 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 1.5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
23	199	Brij Mohan Beldar	Arun Kumar Tyagi	21-01-1982	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
24	54	Mahender Singh Assistant Supervisor	Arvind Kumar	14-04-1985	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
25	108	Dharam Pal Peon	Asha	18-06-1991	The applicant has declared herself as unemployed and unmarried. However, records indicate that she was employed with NITCON Ltd. and engaged with DDA. Further, the applicant herself submitted an application dated 14.08.2024 to DDA requesting a transfer near to her residence in order to care for her husband and child. In view of the false and contradictory information furnished by the applicant, the Committee has rejected the case.
26	462	Ramesh Kumar Beldar	Ashish	23-06-1986	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed education qualification criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025
27	127	Anuj Atri Asst. Director	Ashish Atri	28-06-1987	The Committee, after due consideration, has rejected the case on account of discrepancies in the financial disclosures. It has been observed that the subject property, declared at Rs. 7,00,000/- in the 2019 affidavit, has been reflected at a reduced value of Rs. 6,30,000/- in the 2025 affidavit without any documented justification. Further, a fixed deposit amounting to Rs. 40,00,000/-, as declared in the 2019 affidavit, has not been accounted for in the current affidavit, and no status regarding its utilisation or otherwise has been provided
28	363	Suresh Kumar Environment Assitt.	Ashish Kumar	05-10-1990	The committee rejected the case due to deficiencies in the submitted documentation, specifically that the rent agreement furnished with the current affidavit is not duly witnessed.
29	480	Parmod Kumar Khallasi	Ashish Kumar	06-03-1987	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 30 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 4 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
30	265	Lala Beldar	Ashok	13-06-1988	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds of inconsistencies in the information furnished by the applicant. According to the Welfare Inspector's report dated 15.07.2016, the family owns a residential property measuring 25 Sq.Yds. at Tahirpur, Delhi with the widow holding a 100% share. However, in the current affidavit, it is stated that the family is residing in the same property on rent. No information has been provided regarding whether the property was sold, nor have any supporting documents been submitted. Furthermore, as per W.I. Report the electricity bill was in the name of the deceased employee. Furthermore, as per Birth Certificate and 5th Class School Leaving Certificate the date of birth of applicant is 01.04.1985 as as per 10th class certificate his D.O.B.is 13.06.1988. These discrepancies form the basis for the Committee's decision to reject the case.

31	100	Dinesh Kumar S/G	Ashok Kumar	26-07-1992	In the 2019 affidavit, the applicant declared ownership of property bearing H. No. 119, Rama Park, Delhi valued at Rs. 16 lakh owned by Widow. However, in the current affidavit, the applicant has neither disclosed the status of the said property (i.e., whether it remains in his possession or has been sold) nor provided any supporting details and stated in the current affidavit that he is residing on rent at H. No. 424, Mangol Puri with Nil property valuation. Accordingly, the Committee has rejected the case on account of suppression of material information and inconsistencies in the applicant's declarations.
32	208	Bane Singh Mali	Ashok Kumar	15-04-1995	The Screening Committee rejected the case due to discrepancies in the information furnished and providing incomplete information. The applicant did not disclose the value of the residential property in the current affidavit while stating that it is an ancestral property. However, the same property had been declared with a valuation of ₹3 lakh in the 2019 affidavit. Further, as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 15.09.2014, the family owns agricultural land measuring 02 bighas in Village Sikanderpur, District Jhajjar, Haryana, with the widow holding 100% share. However, the applicant did not provide the status of the said agricultural property in the current affidavit despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
33	325	Hukam Singh Beldar	Ashu Gusain	20-07-1986	The applicant has failed to submit rent receipts along with the rent agreement, as required under the notification dated 30.05.2025. Accordingly, the Committee has rejected the case on account of submission of an incomplete affidavit.
34	20	Om Prakash Singh Mate	Avinash Tomar	05-08-1993	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 14.5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 6 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
35	403	Nanak Chand S/G	Balkishan	15-10-1992	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
36	270	Jasvant Singh Beldar	Beer Singh	12-07-1996	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
37	185	Ramesh Chand Beldar	Bhagwan Singh	04-01-1991	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
38	376	Moti Ram Mate	Bharat	12-04-1983	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
39	5	Nathey Ram Mali W/C(R)	Bhushan	16-09-1984	The committee rejected the case as the applicant omitted the status of motor car/ automobile in movable property thus rendering the affidavit incomplete
40	2	Trilok Chand Peon	Bimla	11-10-1969	The committee rejected the case as the applicant omitted the status of motor car/ automobile in movable property thus rendering the affidavit incomplete
41	391	Babu Ram Mali	Brijesh	03-12-1987	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 4.5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 3 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
42	423	Shyoneder Kasana Mali	Chaman	10-09-1994	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
43	96	Beer Singh Garden Supervisor	Chaman Prakash	23-04-1982	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)

44	504	Gopal Mali	Chander Pal	09-11-1984	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 13.7 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 4 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility. Further despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
45	477	Surender Singh Mali	Chandu Singh	20-07-1995	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 7 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 3 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
46	454	Moman Singh Ex. Suerintendent	Charan Singh	14-03-1970	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
47	401	Bal Kishan Head Clerk	Chirag	02-10-1990	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 7 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
48	205	Surender Singh S/G	Dalbir Singh Kataria	28-01-1989	The Screening Committee, rejected the case due to multiple discrepancies and inconsistencies in the documents and information submitted. The applicant declared the value of the subject property as ₹2.5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit; however, in the 2025 affidavit, the valuation has been shown as Nil, and the property has been described as unauthorized. In support of this claim, the applicant submitted a letter regarding unauthorized encroachment, but the document pertains to Ward No. 5, whereas the applicant's residence is in Ward No. 8, rendering the proof incorrect and unrelated. Additionally, the applicant has stated that he is working as outsourced staff, yet the bank balance has been declared as Nil without supporting documents, raising concerns regarding the accuracy of the financial information provided.
49	266	Bhai Lal S/G	Dalip Kumar	20-07-1987	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 13 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 4.5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
50	235	Gyan Chand Khallasi	Darshana	05-08-1989	The committee rejected the case due to submission of false information, as the applicant declared that the family was not receiving any pension, whereas the record shows receipt of a basic pension of Rs. 9,000 per month
51	311	Hanuman Beldar	Daulat	17-04-1985	The committee rejected the case due to discrepancies in the financial information provided, as the applicant was employed (NITCON) yet declared a NIL bank balance, while the bank statement reflected a balance of Rs. 5.56 on 16.08.2025, and the required bank balance statement as on 31.05.2025 was not furnished.
52	139	Mahender Singh S/G	Deepak	13-10-1988	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant declared the value of his property as ₹8 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, whereas in the 2025 affidavit, the same property has been reported at a reduced value of ₹5 lakh. In the absence of any documentary justification supporting such depreciation, the disclosure appears inconsistent and lacks financial credibility. Further, the No Objection Certificate (NOC) from Ms. Preeti, which was submitted along with the 2019 affidavit, has not been furnished with the current affidavit. Moreover, while the 2019 affidavit stated that the applicant had sold the property for ₹8 lakh, the 2025 affidavit reflects a contradictory position, wherein the applicant claims ownership of the same property with a stated value of ₹5 lakh.
53	490	Om Prakash Mate	Deepak Choudhary	13-09-1988	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that the rent receipt submitted by the applicant was not signed by the landlord/owner of the property.

54	174	Bishamber Singh Beldar	Deepak Kumar	12-12-1989	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 1.8 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 1.5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
55	500	Devraj Singh Wireman	Deepak Kumar	25-07-1987	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
56	114	Omwati Environment Asstt.	Deepak Sharma	27-06-1993	The committee rejected the application as the affidavit submitted was not signed by the applicant
57	479	Jai Prakash Singh S/G	Deepak Singh	16-05-1993	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the rent agreement lacks the signature of a witness, rendering the submission incomplete and despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
58	252	Dayanand Peon	Deepak Yadav	04-01-1991	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant, despite being an employee of Nitcon Ltd., did not mention their bank balance, thereby rendering the affidavit incomplete.
59	485	Neelam Khurana PS	Deepali Khurana	13-11-1994	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 20 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 15 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility. Furthermore the applicant has not provided the details of cash thus rendering the affidavit incomplete and despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
60	74	Vijay Pal Mali	Devendar Pal	22-12-1987	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds of inconsistencies in the information furnished by the applicant. As per the 2019 affidavit, the family owned property at Sultanpuri with a valuation of Rs 8 lakh; however, in the current affidavit, it has been stated that the family is residing in the same property on rent. No information has been provided as to whether the property was sold as required by the notification, nor have any supporting details been furnished. Furthermore rent agreement submitted is of different property.
61	146	Rambir Mali	Devendra Pal	01-07-1984	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 6.71 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 4.75 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility. Furthermore, agriculture land with 3 bigha widow share was disclosed in welfare inspector report dated 23.03.2014 however the same was not disclosed in current affidavit.
62	377	Krishan Pal Beldar	Dharmender Kaushik	01-07-1990	The committee rejected the case due to incomplete and inconsistent information, specifically that the applicant declared ownership of a residential property in Village Sankraud, Baghpat, U.P., valued at Rs. 1,87,296 (1/3rd share) in the 2019 affidavit, whereas in the current 2025 affidavit the value of the said property has not been disclosed, and although the applicant states that he is presently residing on rent, no information has been provided regarding the current status of the previously declared property, including whether it has been sold or rented out.
63	283	Jai Chand Beldar	Dharmendra	10-05-1993	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 20 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 12,50,000/- in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
64	305	Bijender Kumar Mali	Dinesh Kumar	12-12-1991	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
65	452	Satish Chand Sharma Pump Operator	Dinesh Sharma	05-04-1989	The committee rejected the case due to submission of incomplete affidavit, as the applicant has not furnished the valuation of property in the affidavit.

66	155	Dhan Singh Mali	Durgesh Pal	14-06-1994	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that the signature of the applicant was missing above the deponent in the affidavit submitted by the applicant
67	369	Sahaj Ram Tiwari Dy. Dir.	Gagan Tiwari	03-03-1992	The committee rejected the case due to furnishing of false information. The applicant declared himself as unemployed, whereas records show he was employed with NITCON Ltd. and engaged as a DEO in DDA at the time of submission of affidavit.
68	153	Sedu Ram Mali	Ganga Sahai	04-04-1982	The committee rejected the case due to the fact that, as mentioned in the Welfare Inspector's report dated 26.10.2017, the family owned a house at their native place in Jaipur and the widow along with one son, Sh. Deepak, were residing there at that time; however, the current affidavit submitted in 2025 does not mention the present status of the said property or residence
69	164	Ajit Kumar Sweeper Cum Sever	Gaurav	12-03-1988	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed education qualification criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025
70	327	Ved Prakash Mali	Gaurav Nagar	10-04-1997	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 12 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 3 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
71	385	Bharat Singh S/G	Gaurav Nagar	10-05-1991	The committee rejected the case due to inconsistencies and deficiencies in the adoption-related documents, specifically that as per the affidavit/NOC and Aadhaar Card the date of birth of Ms. Salu (adopted daughter) is 25.06.2010, whereas the unregistered adoption deed dated 21.06.2009 records her date of birth as 04.01.2009, and further indicates that she, along with Ms. Nikki, was adopted prior to her stated birth, and additionally the adoption deed lacks the signature of the first party while bearing the signature of Kishan as the second party, all of which render the documents unreliable and formed the basis for rejection.
72	225	Bir Singh Meter Reader	Gaurav Singh	01-07-1991	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that the NOC affidavits contain contradictory information. In point 7 of the affidavits, each family member has declared that none other than themselves is employed, which implies that all members are employed. However, in the family details provided in the same NOCs, only the applicant, Shri Gaurav Singh, is shown as employed, resulting in inconsistency in the disclosures. Moreover, the applicant has stated that he is residing in a rented property but has failed to submit any rent receipts along with the current affidavit of 2025.
73	165	Bijender Chowkidar W/C	Gourav Kumar	09-12-1991	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's residential address has been reported inconsistently, being stated as H. No. 307/6, Budh Bazar, Sangam Vihar, South Delhi-62 in the affidavit, whereas the rent agreement reflects a different address, i.e., LI-5/264, Khasra No. 34, First Floor, L-I Block, Gali No. 5, Sangam Vihar, Delhi; further, the status of the property at Sangam Vihar as declared in the affidavit has not been clarified, thereby rendering the submission inconsistent and incomplete.
74	348	Suresh Kumar Pump Operator	Gulshan Kumar	18-09-1991	The committee rejected the case due to inconsistencies in financial and family disclosures. Despite being employed with NITCON Ltd., the applicant has declared a nil bank balance without providing supporting documents, which raises concerns regarding financial credibility. Further, three family members (one minor son, one minor daughter, and the deceased official's mother) have been included in the current affidavit but were not mentioned in the 2019 affidavit, the 2018 affidavit submitted at the time of application, the nomination form, the ration card, or the medical card, rendering the submission inconsistent and unreliable.

75	95	Ramesh Chand Pandey S/G	Hanuman Pandey	01-03-1994	In the 2019 affidavit, the applicant declared ownership of a property valued at ₹5.5 lakh and submitted GPA documents as supporting evidence. However, in the current affidavit, the applicant has neither disclosed the status of the said property (i.e., whether it is still in possession or has been sold) nor provided any supporting details. Instead, the applicant has declared that he is residing in rented accommodation and has shown a nil valuation under property. Accordingly, the Committee has rejected the case on account of suppression of material information and inconsistency in the applicant's declarations.
76	278	Yasin Mali	Happy	21-09-1993	The Committee rejected the case due to unexplained discrepancies in the disclosure of assets and income. A property (90 sq. yds as per WI report dated 06.09.2013) situated at Village Wair, Bulandshahr, U.P., which was valued at ₹4 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, has been reported at a reduced value of ₹3 lakh in the 2025 affidavit without any supporting justification or documentation explaining such depreciation. Further, although Ms. Yameen has been shown as employed in the current application, her income has not been disclosed. In the absence of complete and transparent financial disclosures, the information furnished is considered unreliable and non-credible.
77	210	Rajender Singh Peon	Hari Prakash	04-12-1990	The committee rejected the case on the ground that the applicant failed to mention the name of Shri Jaibeer/Jaiveer in the current affidavit (2025), despite his name having been included in Annexure-A at the time of applying for appointment on compassionate grounds, as well as in the Welfare Inspector's report dated 21.03.2017, earlier affidavits/NOCs. Furthermore, in the current affidavit for 2025, no No Objection Certificate (NOC) from Shri Jaibeer/Jaiveer has been provided. Additionally, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
78	132	Satbir Singh Beldar	Harish Kumar	16-11-1989	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
79	407	Paramjit Singh PS	Harsh Singh	17-10-1995	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 20.6 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 15 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
80	421	Bhuwan Chandra Mathpal UDC	Hemant Mathpal	17-03-1985	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
81	430	Kharak Singh Mali	Hemlata	10-08-1999	The Committee rejected the case on account of multiple discrepancies observed in the documents and disclosures submitted by the applicant. As per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 16.05.2014 and Annexure-A submitted by the applicant at the time of applying for appointment on compassionate grounds, as well as earlier affidavits/NOCs, the names of both Ms. Renu and Shri Jagbeer were included. However, in the current affidavit, the applicant failed to submit the requisite NOCs from both individuals. Additionally, Ms. Hemlata has been described as employed in a private job while simultaneously being shown as unemployed in the same set of records. These contradictory and incomplete disclosures raise serious concerns regarding the accuracy, consistency, and credibility of the information furnished by the applicant.
82	365	Veer Pal Handa Photographic Officer	Hitesh Handa	28-11-1999	The committee rejected the case due to inconsistencies and missing documentation. The deceased official's mother was not included in the nomination form or application form submitted in 2019 but her name appears in current affidavit while no ID proof (as required by the notification) has been provided for her. Additionally, the rent agreement lacks a witness signature, further rendering the submission incomplete and unreliable.

83	468	Ramesh Kumar OCM	Jahnvi Girotra	11-10-1997	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's submissions are incomplete, inconsistent and lack financial credibility, as the property valued at Rs. 13,00,000 in the 2019 affidavit is stated to have been sold for Rs. 7,50,000 however an unregistered sale agreement was provided as proof, the applicant's brother is shown as employed while total family income is declared as 'Nil', the rent agreement lacks the signature of a witness, and a monthly rent of Rs. 33,000 is reported despite the only disclosed income being family pension with a basic amount of Rs. 12,120 per month, which, even with dearness allowance, is insufficient to meet such expenditure
84	394	Vijay Singh Negi Pump Operator	Jaikrit Singh Negi	16-11-1978	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (coverage)
85	324	Ram Prakash S/G	Jaiwati	10-12-1968	The committee rejected the case due to incomplete submission. The rent agreement submitted pertains to H. No. 711, whereas the applicant has stated residing at N-104/124. Additionally, no information or documentation has been furnished regarding the status of the property at N-104/124
86	498	Subhash Mali	Jitender Kumar	18-06-1985	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
87	149	Jugat lal Yadav S/G	Jitender yadav	05-06-2000	The committee noted that the applicant's affidavit contained contradictory information, listing his marital status as both married and unmarried in the same affidavit.
88	220	Phool Singh S/G	Jitendra Singh	16-02-1996	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds of inconsistencies in the information furnished by the applicant. As per the 2019 affidavit, the family owned a property at H.No.347, Village Sapnawat, District Hapur, U.P. with a valued at ₹2.80 lakh; however, in the current affidavit of 2025, it has been stated that the family is residing in the same property on rent. No information has been provided regarding whether the property was sold, nor have any supporting documents/details been furnished. Further, the rent agreement submitted by the applicant does not bear the signatures of any witnesses.
89	367	Om Prakash Mali	Johny	26-11-1982	The committee rejected the case due to missing documentation. While NOCs/affidavits for Naresh Kumar, Savitri Devi, and Umesh Kumar were submitted in 2019, they have not been provided with the current application, rendering the submission incomplete.
90	364	Raj Kumar Beldar	Kanchan	28-01-1991	The committee rejected the case due to incomplete and inconsistent information, as the applicant declared ownership of a residential property at H. No. 1/5839, Shahdara, Delhi valued at Rs. 1.50 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, whereas in the current 2025 affidavit the value of the said property has not been disclosed, and although the applicant states that he is presently residing on rent, no information has been provided regarding the current status of the previously declared property, including whether it has been sold or rented out
91	422	R. Mugam Mali	Kanda Swami	01-01-1991	The Committee rejected this case on the grounds that the Applicant's disclosures are incomplete and inconsistent, as the required rent slip was not provided, and despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
92	488	Bhikam Singh yadav	Kapil Yadav	21-01-1994	In the 2019 affidavit, the applicant declared ownership of a property valued at ₹10.50 lakh. The same property was also reflected in the Welfare Inspector's report dated 06.06.2012, which recorded a residential property located in the Sangam Vihar area measuring 100 sq. yds., with the widow holding full share. However, in the current affidavit, the applicant has not provided the valuation of the said property. In view of this omission and inconsistency in the declarations, the Committee has rejected the case on the grounds of suppression of material information. Furthermore despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.

93	370	Ram Phal Mali	Kavita Choudhary	24-08-1992	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, as per the affidavit dated 2025, the applicant's residential address is recorded as H. No. 256, Ghondli Village, Krishna Nagar, East Delhi. However, as per the rent agreement submitted along with the current affidavit (2025), which lacks witnesses' signatures, the property mentioned therein is 176, Second Floor, Village Ghondli, Delhi. This is a completely different property from the residential address stated in the affidavit. Furthermore, according to the Welfare Inspector's report dated 25.07.2013, the family had stated that the property in question, i.e., H. No. 256, Ghondli Village, Krishna Nagar, East Delhi, belongs to their relative. In contrast, a shopkeeper and an individual present in the factory on the ground floor stated that the said property belongs to Late Shri Ramphal (deceased employee).
94	94	Rajo Devi Beldar	Krishan Kumar	07-05-1978	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
95	35	Vishram Meena Sr. Mali	Krishn Meena	14-05-2005	The committee rejected the case as the applicant omitted the status of motor car/ automobile in movable property thus rendering the affidavit incomplete
96	378	Ram Babu Sharma Beldar	Krishna Kant Bhardwaj	12-09-2001	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant has furnished two separate addresses, namely a permanent address and a current address. While a rent agreement has been submitted in respect of the current address, no information or supporting documents have been provided regarding the status or ownership of the permanent address. Further, the rent agreement submitted by the applicant does not bear the signatures of witnesses, thereby affecting its authenticity and evidentiary value. In the absence of complete and properly supported documentation, the disclosures made in the application are considered inadequate and unreliable.
97	19	Brijpal Singh Garden Supervisor	Kuldeep Kumar	16-11-2001	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's residential address is different from the one reflected in rent agreement, further, the status of the residential address as declared in the affidavit has not been clarified, thereby rendering the submission inconsistent and incomplete. Additionally rent agreement is in the name of Sh. Charan Singh who as per record expired in the year 2018 while the agreement was signed by wife of Sh. Charan Singh.
98	318	Sahendra Pal Singh Mali	Kuldeep Singh	10-01-1981	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
99	181	Rajender Kumar Khallasi	Lalit Kumar	28-02-1991	The applicant has declared himself as unemployed. However, as per record he was employed with NITCON Ltd. and engaged in DDA at the time of submission of affidavit. In view of the false and contradictory information furnished by the applicant, the Committee has rejected the case.
100	10	Jai Prakash S/G	Lalit Sharma	03-12-1987	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant failed to reconcile the present application with the one submitted in 2017 for appointment on compassionate grounds, as well as with the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 13.10.2017. Since, there is a family member of the deceased employee, namely Shri Vijay Sharma, for whom no No Objection Certificate (NOC) has been submitted along with the current affidavit of 2025. In the absence of the NOC or clarification regarding the status of the above family member, the Committee considered the application incomplete.
101	186	Ram Bharose Beldar	Lalit Yadav	28-12-1998	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document. Further the signature of the applicant was missing above the deponent
102	129	Ram Baksh Mali	Leeladhar	10-09-1994	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 3.65 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
103	346	Ashok Kumar Sweeper	Lokeshwar	15-09-1984	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.

104	197	Lala Prasad Lift Operator	Madhuri	28-11-1991	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 15-20 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 14 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
105	211	Dharam Dutt Sharma Mali	Mahender Sharma	26-01-1989	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 20 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 15 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
106	261	Ramesh Chand S/G	Mahesh Chand	10-05-1985	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
107	172	Kalwa Pal Mali	Mamta	29-04-1996	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 10 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
108	443	Virender Singh Bisht J. E.	Manish Bisht	20-10-1992	The committee rejected the case due to the observation that, as per the nomination form submitted by the deceased official, Ms. Priyanka Bisht was listed as a daughter; however, in the current affidavit, no NOC was received from her, and instead an NOC was submitted by Ms. Sakshi Anand with the same date of birth, without any clarification whether they are the same person. Moreover, the PAN card of Ms. Sakshi Anand mentions her father's name as Sh. Jagdeep Anand, whereas the deceased official's name is Late Sh. Virender Singh Bisht, thereby creating a discrepancy regarding her identity.
109	347	Suresh Chand Mali	Manish Sharma	13-07-1994	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
110	361	Ramesh Mali	Manjeet	06-08-1991	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant failed to disclose the bank balance and cash amount in the affidavit thus rendering the application incomplete
111	106	Ram Deen Beldar	Manoj	30-10-1983	As per the current affidavit dated 2025, the applicant is stated to be residing at 208, Ekta Vihar, R.K. Puram, Delhi. However, no rent agreement along with rent receipts, nor any proof of ownership of property with valuation details, as required under the Notification dated 30.05.2025, has been submitted. However, as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 16.09.2013, the widow's family was recorded as residing in a rented accommodation at 208, JJ Colony, Ekta Vihar, R.K. Puram, Delhi. In view of the absence of mandatory supporting documents and submission of an incomplete affidavit, the Committee has accordingly rejected the case.
112	285	Mathura Prasad Mali	Manoj Kumar	01-07-1986	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
113	292	Jai Prakash Beldar	Manoj Kumar	24-03-1985	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 6 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 4.76 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
114	388	Chander Kumar Singh Mali	Manoj Kumar	01-04-1986	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 4 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 2.5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
115	293	Shiv Charan Mali	Manoj Pal	01-05-1984	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 4.96 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.

116	458	Parimal Mali	Mariappan	21-05-1992	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 7.5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
117	463	Bhavnesk Kumar Gupta UDC	Mayank Goel	01-11-1991	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 50 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 7 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
118	13	Kali Charan Mali	Meenakshi	24-02-1993	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 2.5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 1.5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
119	286	Rajbir Singh Mali	Mohan Chaudhary	20-07-1995	The committee rejected the case as the applicant omitted the status of cash in movable property thus rendering the affidavit incomplete
120	226	Mahinder Singh Khallasi	Mohit Kumar	22-08-1998	The applicant has declared himself as unemployed; however, records show that he was employed with NITCON Ltd. and was engaged in DDA. In view of the false and misleading information furnished, the Committee has decided to reject the application.
121	441	Vijender Singh	Mohit Kumar	01-01-1993	The Committee rejected this case on the grounds that the Applicant's affidavit is incomplete, as the applicant has omitted bank balance and cash value in the current affidavit
122	464	Dharmvir Mali	Mohit Yadav	13-08-1988	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's submissions are incomplete, as NOCs of three members have not been provided, the current affidavit shows the property as rented with nil property valuation however the rent agreement lacks the signature of a witness. Further the rent agreement is executed between the applicant and the widow, both of whom were dependents of the deceased at the time of death.
123	282	Panna lal S/G	Momin	30-03-1993	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant failed to provide the valuation of the property. Further, although the applicant disclosed that the family is residing in an unauthorized area (Jhuggi), no supporting documents or proof regarding the status of the said property/area were submitted. Additionally, while the applicant stated that her brother is working as an auto driver, his income details were not disclosed in the affidavit. Further, as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 13.07.2018, the family owns a residential property measuring 25 sq. yds. at E-20A/473, Jawahar Mohalla, Patparganj, Delhi, in which the widow holds a 100% share. However, the value of the said property has not been disclosed in the current affidavit, while simultaneously claiming it to be situated in an unauthorized area (Jhuggi).
124	300	Chandrika Prasad Khallasi	Mritunjay	10-05-1990	The committee rejected the application due to conflicting records for the applicant's brother, Gautam. While a 2025 affidavit and Aadhaar list Gautam's Date of Birth (DoB) as 01.07.2000, his 2019 affidavit & Welfare Inspector reports it as 01.01.1999. Furthermore welfare inspector dated 26.11.2014 mentions approx. 40 sq yard property in Native place at deoria, U.P. where some family residing. In the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has not provided the current status of this property (i.e. whether sold or still in possession). Further, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
125	140	Chahat Mali	Mukesh	01-04-1988	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that, as per the affidavit/NOC submitted along with the current affidavit, the applicant's brothers, Shri Sumit Kumar and Shri Amit Dhama, are both employed and residing with the applicant; however, their income has not been disclosed. Despite this, the applicant has declared the total family income from all sources as Nil

126	257	Sukhpal Singh S/G	Mukesh Kumar	10-08-1992	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 05 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 4.65 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
127	438	Ram Gopal S/G	Mukesh Kumar	03-05-1986	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds of incomplete disclosure. As per the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 03.04.2013, the family owns a residential property measuring 50 Sq. Yds in village Naugwan, Aligarh, UP with full share in the name of the widow. However, applicant also submit a residential property at village Naugwan, Aligarh, U.P. with value Rs. 60000/- in affidavit 2019 but he failed to provide the current status of above said property in affidavit submitted in 2025.
128	341	Dari Chand Beldar	Mukesh Manjhi	17-03-1994	The committee rejected the case due to inconsistencies in the declaration of dependants. In the 2012 and 2019 affidavits, only Mukesh and Shanti Devi were shown as dependants, with no mention of an unmarried daughter, Ms. Ranu Kumari. However, in the current affidavit, Ms. Ranu Kumari is included as an unmarried daughter, despite her name not appearing in the welfare report, nomination form, or PPO book, rendering the submission inconsistent and unreliable.
129	162	Nuruddin S/G	Mustaq Ali	19-09-1988	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant has not furnished the NOC from Shri Ishtyaq Alam in the current affidavit, whereas the NOC from Shri Ishtyaq Alam had been duly submitted in the 2019 affidavit, thereby indicating inconsistency and incomplete disclosure in the information provided.
130	166	Kanhiya Lal Mali	Nahar Singh	02-07-1986	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
131	269	Gulbir Singh Beldar	Nain Singh	16-09-1970	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
132	160	Nurul Hoda A.E.	Najmul Hoda	23-05-1994	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
133	357	Mahender Singh Khallasi	Nakul Dudhwal	07-11-1990	The committee rejected the case due to inconsistencies in the reported value of property, specifically that as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 08.05.2018 the family owns a 60 sq. mtr. property in Mahipalpur, Delhi with 100% share in the name of the widow, and the applicant declared its value as Rs. 20,39,249 in the 2019 affidavit, whereas in the 2025 affidavit he claims this was a mistake and revises the value to Rs. 2,39,249, without furnishing adequate justification or supporting evidence for such a substantial variation.
134	142	Laxman Singh Khallasi	Narender Singh	06-03-1986	The Screening Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the marital status of the daughter of the deceased official has been inconsistently reported, being shown as married in the 2019 affidavit but reported as unmarried in the current affidavit 2025.
135	366	Sant Ram S/G	Narendra	11-11-1988	The committee rejected the case due to discrepancies in financial and property details. The applicant has not mentioned cash details, and while the subject property was valued at Rs. 10 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, the current affidavit declares that the applicant is renting in the same property, without clarifying whether it has been sold or otherwise disposed of, rendering the submission incomplete and inconsistent.
136	317	Ranjeet Singh S/G	Naresh	18-09-1993	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds of incomplete disclosure. As per the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 26.02.2013, the family owns an agricultural property measuring 1 acre in Kherla, Gurgaon, with full share in the name of the widow. However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has not provided the current status of this property. Furthermore despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.

137	493	Bijendra Singh Mali	Naveen Nain	03-02-1996	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the records contain a clear inconsistency, as the date of birth (DoB) of the applicant's brother is stated as 06.07.2001 in the current affidavit and adhaar, whereas it is recorded as 06.07.1997 in the nomination form signed on 06.01.2001, which predates the date of birth mentioned in the current affidavit. Furthermore another aadhar card with DoB as 06.07.2000 also found in the record and in the 2019 affidavit his DoB was mentioned as 03.02.1999. Additionally despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
138	333	Mohan Chand Sati Mate	Neeraj Sati	05-05-1988	The committee rejected the case due to inconsistencies in the application and the record available. As per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 03.11.2015, the family owns a residential property measuring 35 sq. yds., bearing No. RZU-87, Block, Nihal Vihar, Nangloi, Delhi, with the widow holding a 100% share. However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has furnished a rent agreement in respect of the same property, which was previously occupied by the family, without clarifying whether the above property has been sold or not. In the event that the property has been sold, the applicant has not disclosed the sale consideration in the current affidavit.
139	43	Baleshwar Yadav Mali	Niranjan Yadav	29-08-1993	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds of incomplete disclosure. As per the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 16.09.2012, the family owns an agricultural property measuring 1 bigha in Village Sundra, Nawada, Bihar, in which the widow holds 100% share. However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has not provided the current status of this property. This omission formed the basis for rejection of the case.
140	12	Shambhu Nath Beldar	Om Prakash	15-01-2001	The applicant's 10th-grade certificate lists a Date of Birth (DoB) of 15-01-2001. However, a 1997 nomination form already lists the applicant with a DoB of 05-09-1997. Because the applicant appeared in records prior to 2001, the committee rejected the case for providing false information.
141	228	Bhushan Kumar Mali	Pankaj Kumar	24-12-1989	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
142	275	Dharam Pal Peon	Pankaj Kumar	01-02-1988	The committee rejected the case on the grounds of contradictory statement submitted by the applicant. As the brother of applicant, residing with him, is shown as employed however total family income is mentioned as NIL in the current affidavit.
143	492	Krishan Pal	Pankaj Kumar	14-06-1995	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 3.5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 2.85 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
144	502	Prem Nath Mali	Pankaj Kumar Singh	11-02-1982	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
145	216	Mansingh Beldar	Pankaj Pal	21-05-1993	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that the applicant had declared a property in Loni valued at ₹5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit; however, in the current affidavit, the applicant stated that the said property has been sold and submitted a Power of Attorney (Mukhtarname), but did not disclose the sale consideration/value of the property. Moreover, the applicant has also submitted a rent agreement (for a period 04.03.2025 to 03.02.2026) which does not bear the signature of the landlord, and no witnesses have signed the said rent agreement.
146	435	Rameshwar Das J.E.	Parmod Kumar	03-06-1987	In the 2019 affidavit, the applicant declared ownership of two properties valued at Rs 25 lakh and Rs. 20 lakh. However, in the current affidavit, the applicant has declared ownership of only one property and has neither disclosed the status of the other property (i.e., whether it is still in possession or has been sold) nor provided any supporting details.. Accordingly, the Committee has rejected the case on account of suppression of material information and inconsistency in the applicant's declarations.

147	159	Kasturi Devi Mali	Parveen Chawla	21-09-1979	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
148	148	Sumer Singh Asth. Supervisor	Parveen Kumar	17-03-1987	The committee rejected the case as the affidavit submitted by the applicant mentioned three family members as employed, namely applicant, Sh. Satish and Sh. Satya Prakash all living in the same residence but family income is provided for applicant only.
149	193	Jagdish Singh Mali	Pawan Kumar	16-02-1984	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that, as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 05.02.2014, the family owned a property in Rithala, Delhi, in which the widow had full share. However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has stated that the said property is owned by his grandparents and that he is residing therein on rent however the applicant has failed to submit any rent agreement or supporting document along with the 2025 affidavit to substantiate his claim of tenancy. An electricity bill was also found in the record which was in the name of deceased official.
150	446	Raja Ram Manjhi S/G	Poonam Kumari	15-04-1987	The applicant has declared herself as unemployed. However, as per record she was employed with NITCON Ltd. and engaged in DDA at the time of submission of affidavit. In view of the false and contradictory information furnished by the applicant, the Committee has rejected the case.
151	190	Raje S/G	Pradeep	05-07-1990	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed education qualification criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025
152	331	Jaipal Singh S/G	Pradeep Baisoya	16-06-1995	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. As per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 05.02.2014, the family owns a residential property measuring 150 sq. yds. in Village Barola, Sector-49, Noida, with the widow holding a 100% share. In the affidavit submitted in 2019, the applicant declared a residential property in Village Barola, Tehsil Dadri, District Gautam Buddha Nagar, measuring 50 sq. yds., with a stated value of ₹9,10,000. However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has declared a residential property bearing H. No. 233, near Mother Dairy, Barola, Sector-49, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Uttar Pradesh, with a stated value of ₹1,50,000. No justification has been provided for the significant reduction in the value of the property if both declarations pertain to the same property. Alternatively, if the properties are different, the applicant has failed to provide details of the property disclosed in the 2019 affidavit.
153	4	Narender Kumar Mate W/C(R)	Pradeep Kumar	24-06-1988	The committee rejected the case due to submission of false information, as the applicant declared that the family was not receiving any pension, whereas the record shows receipt of a basic pension of Rs. 10,590 per month
154	373	Tej Singh Beldar	Pradeep Kumar	25-02-1988	The committee rejected the case due to inconsistency in the declared ownership and valuation of the residential property, specifically that the applicant has stated in the current affidavit that the property is valued at Rs. 1.20 lakh with a 1/5th share, whereas as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 05.03.2014 the widow holds a 100% share. Furthermore, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
155	141	Sultan Singh Beldar	Pradeep Singh	10-05-1989	In the 2019 affidavit, the applicant declared ownership of property at village Banas Post Padal Pauri, Garwal, Uttarakhand, valued Rs. 02 lakh. However, in the current affidavit, the applicant has neither disclosed the status of the said property (i.e., whether it remains in his possession or has been sold) nor provided any supporting details. Accordingly, the Committee has rejected the case on account of suppression of material information and inconsistencies in the applicant's declarations.
156	196	Satyavir Singh Assistant	Prashant	21-05-1995	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 9 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 4.5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.

157	306	Bheem Singh Mali	Prashant Bhati	28-07-1998	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document. Furthermore, although the adoption deed specifies that the second party (biological parents) has no rights over the applicant and all rights belong to the first party(deceased employee), the applicant included his biological family in the current affidavit's family details (Column 7) and submitted their NOCs, apparently to gain points under the 100-point formula. In contrast, the 2019 affidavit listed only the applicant as the surviving member of the deceased employee's family.
158	11	Rajinder Singh S/G	Praveen	22-09-1991	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 3 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 2 lakh in the 2025 affidavit without any documented justification. Furthermore as per the welfare inspector report dated 13.07.2018, family owns an agriculture property measuring 4 Bigha in village Badli in which the widow holds full share, however in the current affidavit status of this agriculture property was not provided.
159	402	Rajinder Singh OCM	Praveen	08-11-1988	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that, in the affidavit submitted in 2019, the applicant declared ownership of property bearing No. 356, Sohati, Kharkhoda, Sonipat, Haryana, value of ₹2.5 lakh. However, in the current affidavit dated 2025, the applicant has disclosed a different property bearing No. 355, Sohati, Kharkhoda, Sonipat, Haryana, with a declared value of ₹1 lakh. Further, the applicant has failed to clarify the status of the property earlier declared in the 2019 affidavit, including whether the said property has been sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of. The absence of any explanation or supporting documentation regarding the discrepancy in property details and valuation raises serious concerns about the accuracy, consistency, and credibility of the disclosures made in the application.
160	482	Vikram Singh S/G	Pravesh	25-04-1986	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's financial disclosures are inconsistent and incomplete, as the same property valued at Rs. 4,00,000 in the 2019 affidavit is declared at a reduced value of Rs. 2 lakh in the 2025 affidavit without documented justification, and the status of agricultural land, valued at Rs. 6 lakh mentioned in the 2019 affidavit, has not been disclosed in the current affidavit
161	30	Jagbir Beldar	Rahul	10-04-1997	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that, as per the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 12.05.2016, the family owned a residential property bearing No. EE-2647, Jahangir Puri, Delhi, measuring 25 sq. yds., in which the widow had full ownership. However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has not disclosed the status of this property.
162	51	Raj Kumar OCM	Rahul	21-06-1991	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that the applicant's claim of residing in rented accommodation could not be verified, as no rent agreement was furnished along with the current affidavit declaring residence at 10, Chhatera Bahadurpur, Sonipat, Haryana. Further, the Welfare Inspector's report dated 02.01.2016, duly countersigned by the applicant, recorded that the widow owns a residential house measuring 57 sq. yds. with 100% share in Chhatera Bahadurpur, Sonipat, Haryana. Additionally, the affidavit submitted in 2019 also discloses ownership of above said immovable property with a value of ₹8.76 lakh.
163	201	Jagbir Singh SCD	Rahul	24-10-1996	The committee rejected the case as the applicant did not provided the status of computer/ laptop in movable property thus rendering the affidavit incomplete
164	339	Ram Kumar Mali	Rahul	14-11-1984	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds of incomplete disclosure. As per the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 06.04.2011, the family owns a residential property measuring 50 Sq. Yds in Krishna Vihar, Delhi, with full share in the name of the widow. However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has not provided the current status of this property, which formed the basis for rejection of the case.

165	466	Jai Karan Peon	Rahul	02-06-1991	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
166	410	Mahaveer Singh Mali	Rahul	17-10-1994	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed education qualification criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025
167	326	Komal Prasad Mali	Rahul Dev	01-04-1995	The Committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. In the 2019 affidavit, the subject property was declared at ₹3.5 lakh; however, in the 2025 affidavit, the applicant stated that they are unauthorized occupants of the same property in Nardan Basti and did not provide any valuation for the property without offering any documented justification. Furthermore, as per the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 24.10.2018, the family owns a property measuring 26x10 sq. yds. in Nardan Basti, with full share in the name of the widow and despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
168	184	Bijender Kumar S/G	Rahul Kangar	03-01-1997	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
169	167	Chander Bhan Mali	Rahul Kumar	18-04-1992	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
170	251	Musafil Yadav Mali	Raj Kumar	24-09-1994	The committee rejected the case on the ground that, in the affidavit submitted in 2019, the applicant had declared that the family owned a residential property in Village Rajon, P.O. Pali, District Darbhanga, Bihar valued at ₹2 lakh; however, the current affidavit submitted in 2025 does not disclose the present status of the said property. Further, although the applicant has stated that he is residing at C-149, J.J. Camp, Tigri Camp, Deoli, Delhi, he has not provided the latest market value/status of the property despite it being owned by him or his family members.
171	255	Ram Lalit Mali	Rajbir Paswan	12-06-1990	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
172	291	Tej Ram BCD (W/C)	Rajeev	01-01-1986	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
173	258	Beer Singh S/G	RajKumar	30-12-1974	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
174	260	Molai Ram Peon	RajKumar	09-06-1976	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
175	379	Bir Singh Mali	Rakesh	01-01-1989	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed education qualification criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025
176	224	Kuvar Singh Mali	Rakesh Kumar	07-05-1985	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
177	359	Rishi Ram Mali	Rakesh Kumar	02-05-1980	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age and education qualification criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
178	455	Ramphal Peon	Rakesh Kumar	20-07-1984	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's submissions are incomplete and inconsistent, as all submitted NOCs are unsigned, two 10th marksheets bearing the same roll number/enrollment ID reflect different dates of birth (26-01-1990 and 20-07-1984), and the rent agreement lacks the tenant's signature.
179	161	Bhagwan Dass Mali	Ram Gopal	08-10-1980	The committee rejected the case as the applicant omitted the status of motor car/ automobile in movable property thus rendering the affidavit incomplete. Furthermore as per welfare report dated 09.04.2013, a 10 sq yard commercial property stands in the name of widow which was not disclosed in current affidavit.
180	207	Suresh Singh S/G	Ram Gopal	01-01-1989	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.

181	75	Nand Kishore Fitter	Ram Kishan	19-02-1979	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
182	236	Mathura Prasad Mali	Ram Sajivan	15-03-1978	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
183	249	Rajender Singh S/G	Ramvir Singh	13-04-1985	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
184	254	Prem Singh S/G	Ranjan Singh	07-10-1985	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds of incomplete disclosure. As per the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 12.02.2014, the family owns a residential property measuring 50 sq. yds. in Burari, Kaushik Enclave, with a 1/3 share in the name of the widow (mortgaged property), while the family was living on rent. However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has not provided the current status of this property. The committee also stated that since the property was mortgaged and not sold it could not be shown as rental accomodation.
185	173	Mangali Ram Mali W/C(R)	Ranveer Singh	18-06-1981	The committee rejected the case on the ground that, in the 2019 affidavit, the applicant had disclosed two properties, each with a stated market value of ₹50,000. However, in the latest affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant disclosed only one property with a market value of ₹60,000 and failed to provide any information regarding the status of the other property that had been previously declared.
186	497	Pawan Kumar S/G	Ravi Kumar	19-10-1989	The Committee rejected the case due to submission of false and inconsistent information. As per the welfare inspector report dated 07.06.2016, the family owned property at A-459 JJ colony, Hastals Road however, in the current affidavit, it has been stated that the family is residing in the same property on rent. Further the rent agreement submitted pertains to a property at C-890, JJ colony.
187	338	Nain Singh Forman	Ravinder Kumar	21-12-1983	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 2.2 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 90000 in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
188	409	Rajvir Singh Beldar	Ravinder Singh	23-04-1988	The committee rejected the case due to the observation that, as per the 2019 affidavit, the applicant had declared a property (House No. 19, Nangloi) with a valuation of Rs. 3 lakh; however, in the current affidavit, the applicant has provided valuation of a different property (House No. 11, Nangloi) without any clarification regarding House No. 19 as to whether it is still in possession or has been sold as required by the notification dated 30.05.2025
189	213	Ompal Singh S/G	Ravit Rathi	01-09-1994	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
190	309	Hari Pal Singh Mali	Rinku Kumar	01-12-1994	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 4 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 2 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
191	39	Ashok Kumar Beldar	Rishi Kumar	20-07-1994	The Committee rejected the application for failure to provide property valuation. Furthermore, the Applicant disclosed residency in an unauthorized area H. No. 114, Khyber Pass Mess, Civil Lines, Delhi, but failed to submit any substantiating documentation or proof regarding the status of said area.

192	440	Hiralal Mali	Rohit	08-04-1992	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that the applicant is employed with DDA on an outsourced basis through NITCON, yet has declared both bank balance and cash in hand as NIL in the current affidavit submitted in 2025. In the absence of any supporting explanation or documentary evidence substantiating such disclosure, the financial information furnished by the applicant appears inconsistent and raises doubts regarding the accuracy and credibility of the affidavit. Furthermore, there is no signature of second party on the rent agreement duly submitted by applicant with the current affidavit.
193	81	Kunwar Pal S/G	Rohit Kumar	01-03-1996	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds of incomplete disclosure. As per the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 31.10.2025, the family owns an agricultural property measuring 03 bigha in Village Dhakrauli, Bulandshahr, which stands in the name of Smt. Bhagwati (widow). However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has not provided the current status of this property.
194	175	Sone Lal Mali	Rohit Kumar	10-11-1997	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 2.5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 1.5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
195	308	Satpal Singh Mali	Rohit Kumar	10-10-1991	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
196	416	Rajbir Singh J. E.	Rohit Kumar	25-12-1988	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 17.5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 4.55 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
197	294	Someshwar Dutt Beldar	Rohit Sharma	24-12-1994	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant failed to disclose the bank balance and cash amount in the affidavit.
198	163	Arjun Singh Daftari	Rohtash	15-03-1984	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that, as per the 2019 affidavit, the family owned property bearing No. 118, Gali No. 6, East of Kailash, valued at ₹6 lakh, whereas in the current affidavit it has been stated that the family is residing in the same property on rent however no supporting documentation regarding sale transaction of the property was provided.
199	474	Raj Bahadur Mali	Sachin Kumar	10-09-1997	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 4.5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 2.95 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility. Furthermore, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
200	191	Kartar Singh Mate	Sachin Kumar Upadhyay	29-06-1982	The committee rejected the case as the applicant declared himself employed, with records indicating he was working in NITCON Ltd. and engaged in DDA, while simultaneously reporting the total annual family income as nil
201	451	Rajveer Singh S/G	Sagar Khari	13-08-1996	The committee rejected the case due to the observation that the rent receipts, as required, were not attached with the rent agreement, rendering the application incomplete. Further despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
202	76	Suraj Bhan Mali	Sandeep	10-03-1990	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 3 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 80000 in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.

203	130	Bishan Singh Mali	Sandeep	10-05-1991	In the current affidavit, the applicant has stated that he is residing at property in Lado Sarai, New Delhi. However, the property valuation submitted pertains to a different property located in Gurgaon, Haryana. Furthermore no information regarding the status of property in Lado Sarai was submitted i.e. whether it is rental or owned. Accordingly, the Committee has rejected the case on account of suppression of material information.
204	296	Nerash Kumar Beldar	Sandeep	03-11-1988	The committee rejected the case on the grounds of multiple discrepancies and omissions in the records. The property currently shown as rented was declared in the name of the deceased official in the 2019 affidavit with a value of ₹11.6 lakh. No information has been provided regarding whether the property was sold, nor have any supporting documents been submitted. Furthermore the submitted rent agreement does not pertain to the property in which the applicant claims to be residing. There are also conflicting records regarding the applicant's brother, Sanjeev, whose date of birth is recorded as 06.08.2002 in the 2025 affidavit and Aadhaar, whereas the 2019 affidavit and birth certificate establish it as 06.08.1993.
205	298	Ashok Kumar Beldar	Sandeep	02-08-1989	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 10.4 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
206	362	Bhool Singh S/G	Sandeep Kumar	15-03-1988	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 15 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 4 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
207	439	Niranjan Sharma Khallasi	Sandeep Sharma	20-04-1988	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
208	122	Pratap Singh S/G	Sandeep Singh Shekhawat	23-11-1989	In the 2019 affidavit, the applicant declared a property at House No 860, Jahangirpuri with a valuation of Rs. 3.5 lakh. However, in the current affidavit, valuation of Rs. 25 lakh of another property with address House no 156-157, Jahangirpuri is provided. No information has been provided as to whether the property at House No 860 was sold, nor have any supporting details been furnished.
209	302	Suresh Chand Safai Karamchari	Sanjay	01-08-1990	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in the valuation of assets. The subject property, which was valued at Rs. 1 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was shown as having nil value in the 2025 affidavit on the grounds that it is government property. However, no documentary evidence or justification was provided to explain this change in valuation, thereby undermining the financial credibility of the disclosure. Further, as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 04.04.2018, the family owns a property measuring 30 sq. mtrs. at 291, Sanjay Camp, Dakshinpuri, New Delhi, in which the widow holds a 100% share. The value of this property had also been disclosed in the 2019 affidavit. Moreover, the applicant failed to mention the name of Shri Vijay in the current affidavit (2025), despite his name having been included in the nomination form duly filled by the deceased employee during his lifetime, Annexure-A submitted at the time of applying for appointment on compassionate grounds, earlier affidavits/NOCs, as well as in the Welfare Inspector's report dated 04.04.2018. Furthermore, no No Objection Certificate (NOC) from Shri Vijay has been submitted along with the current affidavit for 2025.
210	447	Rajender Singh Fitter	Sanjeet	20-11-1995	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.

211	135	Kiran Singh J.E.	Sanjeev Kumar	02-04-1989	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that, although the applicant claims to be residing in rented accommodation, one of the three rent receipts submitted along with the current affidavit is unsigned, thereby raising doubts regarding its authenticity. Further, as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 28.04.2014, the family owns a residential property measuring 60 sq. m. situated at Ashok Nagar, Loni Road, Delhi, with a 100% share held by the widow. However, in the current affidavit, the applicant has neither disclosed the present status of the said property, i.e., whether it is still in possession or has been sold, nor furnished any supporting details/documents in this regard. Moreover, the applicant's residential address is mentioned as C-241, DDA LIG Flat, East of Loni Road, Delhi, whereas the rent agreement submitted pertains to a different property, i.e., C-239, DDA LIG Flat, East of Loni Road, Delhi, while the rent receipt is again in respect of property No. C-241. These discrepancies create serious inconsistencies in the documents submitted. In view of the above inconsistencies, discrepancies, and omissions, the information furnished by the applicant lacks reliability and completeness.
212	263	Ram Swarup A. D.	Sanjeev Kumar	25-08-1976	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
213	340	Shankar Singh S/G	Sanjeev Kumar	07-12-1992	The committee rejected the case due to inconsistencies in the applicant's residential details, as the address mentioned in the current affidavit differs from that in the rent agreement. Additionally, the status of the property declared in the affidavit has not been clarified, rendering the submission inconsistent and incomplete
214	426	Ganga Ram Mali	Sanjeev Kumar	12-02-1991	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
215	431	Sardar Singh Khallasi	Sanjeev Kumar	15-04-1991	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's submissions contain multiple discrepancies: the rented property's electricity bill is in the name of the widow, contradicting the tenancy claim, and the property valued at Rs. 1,50,000 in 2019 is now listed as a rental property. Further the rent agreement submitted as proof refers to a different address; the applicant's brother, Sh. Narender, is recorded in 1997/1998 official documents with 1996 as year of birth also in the affidavit submitted in 2019, whereas the Aadhaar card submitted with current affidavit, lists his year of birth as 2000. Since his name appears in the record prior to 2000 this year of birth is implausible and despite confirmed employment with NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without supporting document, reflecting unexplained concealment of financial information
216	460	Ajeet Singh Mali	Sanjeev Yadav	10-05-1989	The committee rejected the case due to the observation that the applicant declared the property valuation as Rs. 10,000 without any supporting documents, which appears implausible given that the property is located in the Capital Region Territory
217	320	Subhash Chand Mate	Sanny Kumar	24-07-1994	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant did not submit the required rent receipt along with the affidavit as required under the notification dated 30.05.2025 and the photocopy of the Aadhaar card of the unmarried daughter is incomplete, with the back side missing.
218	470	Jawahar Paswan S/G	Santosh Paswan	19-10-1990	The committee rejected the case due to the contradictory statement submitted by the applicant in the affidavit wherein he had declared himself as married and unmarried in the same affidavit.
219	336	Lala Ram	Santram	12-05-1980	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
220	395	Om Parkash UDC	Sarita	10-11-1988	The Committee rejected this case on the grounds that the Applicant's affidavit is incomplete, as the applicant has not disclosed bank balance and cash value in the affidavit
221	170	Kukku	Saroj	01-01-1990	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed education qualification criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025

222	329	Sunder Singh S/G	Sarvan Kumar Bansal	22-01-1986	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds of incomplete disclosure. As per the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 01.03.2012, the family owns an agricultural property measuring 06 Bigha in village Palota, U.P., with full share in the name of the widow. However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has not provided the current status of this property i.e. whether sold or still in possession. Furthermore despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
223	386	Heera Lal Verma S/G	Sarvesh Verma	24-04-1996	The Committee rejected this case on the grounds that the rent agreement lacks witness's signature thus rendering the incomplete application.
224	287	Murli Dhar Mali	Satender Singh	03-09-1987	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, as per the current affidavit, the applicant is residing at Plot No. 27/A, Najafgarh, whose value was stated as ₹21 lakh in the 2019 affidavit but reduced to ₹17 lakh in the current affidavit. In support of the revised valuation, the applicant submitted a GPA reflecting ₹17 lakh, however, this document pertains to Plot No. 3A, not Plot No. 27/A. Thus, not only is there an unexplained reduction in the property's value, but no valid valuation for the stated property has been provided.
225	57	Rameshwar Rai Khallasi	Satish	03-10-1995	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's residential address has been reported as RZA-85, Dabri Extension, Palam Village, S.O. South West Delhi-110045 in the affidavit, whereas the rent agreement reflects a different address, i.e. H.-5, Om Vihar, Phase-5, near Main Senik Store, Nawada, Uttam Nagar, West Delhi, further, the status of the property at House no RZA-85 Dabri as declared in the affidavit has not been clarified, thereby rendering the submission inconsistent and incomplete.
226	279	Ratan Singh Mali	Satish Kumar	01-01-1986	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds of inconsistencies in the information provided by the applicant. According to the 2019 affidavit, the family owned a property valued at ₹61,650 with a 1/5th share. However, in the current affidavit, it is stated that the family is residing in the same area on rent. No information has been provided regarding whether the property was sold, nor have any supporting documents been submitted. These discrepancies form the basis for the Committee's decision to reject the case. Furthermore, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
227	418	Ram Chander Mali	Satish Kumar	01-01-1983	The Committee rejected this case on the grounds that the Applicant's submissions contain material inconsistencies and false submission, as the applicant has declared himself unemployed despite being engaged as a DEO through NITCON Ltd. in DDA, a significant and unexplained reduction in property valuation in Mangla Puri from Rs. 5,00,000 in the 2019 affidavit to Rs. 80,000 in the 2025 affidavit was observed without any documented justification.
228	399	Dinesh Raj Beldar	Satish Rai	11-03-1981	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
229	240	Maharaj Singh Garden Supervisor	Satpal	15-07-1986	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
230	229	Harpal Singh Mali	Saviti	10-07-1997	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that the applicant failed to mention the name of Shri Pradeep Kumar in the current RAF (2025), despite his name having been included in the ration card, earlier affidavit/NOC, SMC, and Annexure-A at the time of applying for appointment on compassionate grounds. Furthermore, in the current affidavit for 2025, no No Objection Certificate (NOC) from Shri Pradeep Kumar has been provided.

231	31	Ishan Beldar	Selvaraj	02-09-1988	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's residential address has been reported as G-945, Shakurpur, JJ Colony, Saraswati Vihar, Delhi-110034 in the affidavit, whereas the rent agreement reflects a different address, i.e. WZ-1854, 1st Floor, WZ Block, Multani Mohalla, Rani Bagh, Saraswati Vihar, Delhi-110034, further, the status of the property at House no G-945 as declared in the affidavit has not been clarified, thereby rendering the submission inconsistent and incomplete.
232	459	Akbar Khan Mali	Shakeer	07-07-1997	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's submissions are inconsistent and unsupported, as despite being employed with NITCON Ltd., the applicant has declared a nil bank balance without providing any supporting bank statement, the rent agreement pertains to a property different from the one in which the applicant is residing while stating that he is currently residing in staff quarter as a guest however no supporting documentation provided in this regard. The applicant's younger sister, absent from the 2019 affidavit and Welfare Inspector's report, have been included only in the current affidavit
233	404	Onkar Singh Khallasi	Shakti Singh	15-07-1998	The committee rejected the case due to unexplained discrepancies in asset valuation, as the Welfare Inspector Report dated 01.04.2018 reflects ownership of a 200 sq. yards residential property in Village Mansoorpur, District Baghpat, UP and 4 bigha of agricultural land with 100% share held by the widow, which were also declared in the 2019 affidavit with valuations of ₹8,00,000 and ₹30,00,000 respectively; however, the current affidavit records nil valuation while stating that the property belongs to his uncle. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
234	280	Gyanendra S/G	Shanee	15-07-1990	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that, as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 23.04.2013, the family owns 02 bigha of agricultural land standing in the name of the deceased employee, with the widow holding full share ownership. In addition, a commercial property comprising 02 shops measuring 10 sq. mtrs. is also recorded in the name of the deceased employee, with the widow holding a half share therein. However, the current affidavit fails to disclose the present status, ownership details, or valuation of these properties. In the absence of complete and transparent disclosure regarding the said assets, the information furnished in the application is considered incomplete and unsatisfactory.
235	50	Suresh S/G	Shani Kumar	01-07-1995	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 2 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 1 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
236	432	Ram Singh Mali	Shatrughan Parshad Yadav	06-01-1979	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
237	245	Ram Charan Fitter	Sheela	18-03-1966	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that the applicant failed to mention the names of Ms. Rashmi and Ms. Jyoti in the current RAF (2025), despite their inclusion in the 2019 affidavit, earlier affidavits/NOCs, the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 12.10.2017, and Annexure-A at the time of applying for appointment on compassionate grounds. Furthermore, the current affidavit for 2025 does not include No Objection Certificates (NOCs) from Ms. Rashmi and Ms. Jyoti. It is also noted that the applicant submitted a NOC from Ms. Babli, daughter of Shri Ram Charan (deceased employee), even though her name had never been mentioned in the case records previously.

238	232	Pratap Singh Environment Asstt.	Shiv Kumar	31-05-1985	The committee rejected the case due to discrepancies in the reported value and ownership of the subject property. The property, valued at ₹9.5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was shown at a reduced value of Rs. 4.75 lakh in the 2025 affidavit on the ground that the widow holds a 50% share in the property; however, no supporting proof was furnished in this regard. Furthermore, the welfare report dated 07.01.2016 states that the widow's share in the property is 100%, contradicting the claim made in the later affidavit. Furthermore, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
239	301	Alok Chatterjee OCM	Shshank Chatterjee	04-02-1996	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
240	110	Abhiram Beldar	Shubhajit Pradhan	19-02-2001	In the current affidavit, the applicant has stated that he is residing at property in Vasant Kunj which is owned by his family members. However, the property valuation submitted pertains to a different property located in Odisha. Accordingly, the Committee has rejected the case on account of suppression of material information.
241	176	Adarsh Kumar Khallasi	Shyam Sunder	01-01-1992	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that, in the affidavit submitted in 2019, the applicant had declared ownership of a property valued at Rs. 15 lakh. However, in the current affidavit, the applicant failed to disclose the present status of the said property, i.e., whether it is still in possession or has been sold, and no supporting details/documents were furnished in this regard. Further, the applicant stated that he is residing in a rented accommodation with nil property valuation. As per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 08.06.2016, the family owns a property measuring 38 sq. yds. at WZ-16C, Janakpuri, Delhi, the value of which was also declared by the applicant in the 2019 affidavit.
242	330	Pratap Singh Peon	Singh Raj	10-08-1988	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation, as the subject property was declared at Rs. 9 lakh in the 2019 affidavit but reduced to Rs. 6.44 lakh in the 2025 affidavit without any documented justification. Additionally, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document. Further, the applicant failed to reconcile the current application with the 2019 affidavit, and in the absence of an NOC or status clarification for Sh. Rajesh Kumar, a previously mentioned family member, the application was treated as incomplete.
243	281	Rajbir Singh S/G	Sohan Pal Singh	07-01-1988	The Committee rejected the case as the affidavit submitted by the applicant was unsigned, and the rent agreement submitted was neither signed by any party nor by witness.
244	352	Laxman Mali	Sonu	20-05-1988	The committee rejected the case due to inconsistencies and lack of clarity in the submitted information, specifically that as per the 2019 affidavit the applicant's sister Manju was stated to be married whereas in the 2025 affidavit she is shown as unmarried, and further that the 2019 affidavit recorded a residential property valued at Rs. 18 lakh while the 2025 affidavit states the family is residing in the same property on rent, with no information provided regarding whether the property was sold or any supporting details furnished, and additionally that the applicant's stated residential address is H. No. 105, Phase-4, Aaya Nagar, Delhi whereas the rent agreement pertains to a different address, B-9/268, First Floor, Aaya Nagar, Phase-4, Delhi.
245	55	Mahipal Mali	Sonu Kumar	18-06-1988	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that the signature of the applicant was missing above the deponent in the affidavit submitted by the applicant

246	134	Desh Pal Singh	Sumit	17-06-1991	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation and suppression of material information. The subject property, valued at Rs. 30.05 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 10 lakh in the 2025 affidavit without any documented justification for this depreciation. Further the applicant has not provided any status for the 9 bigha agriculture land as reported in the welfare inspection report dated 20.03.2015 and despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
247	158	Kanwar Singh Mate	Sunil	02-01-1983	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
248	169	Shri Chand Mali	Sunil Kumar	06-04-1996	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that the applicant has not disclosed the status of cash in hand, bank balance and furniture valuation despite such disclosure being required under the prescribed proforma. Furthermore applicant is also an employee of NITCON Ltd. and nil bank balance without any sufficient documentation also warrants rejection
249	262	Mannu Ram Mali	Sunil Kumar	02-12-1992	The committee rejected the case due to submission of false information, as the applicant declared that the family was not receiving any pension, whereas the record shows receipt of a basic pension of Rs. 13,470 per month
250	449	Suresh Mali	Sunil Kumar	10-08-1991	The applicant has declared himself as unemployed. However, as per record he was employed with NITCON Ltd. and engaged in DDA at the time of submission of affidavit. Furthermore the applicant has not submitted complete details of movable property. In view of the incomplete and contradictory information furnished by the applicant, the Committee has rejected the case.
251	499	Mahesh Chandra Joshi Khallasi	Sunil Kumar Joshi	04-08-1986	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
252	202	Rattan Singh S/G	Sunil Sharma	06-06-1983	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
253	247	Chander Sen Mali	Sunny Kumar	26-09-1994	The Committee rejected the case on the ground of incomplete submission. The applicant is residing in a rented property however the rent agreement submitted lacks the required witness signatures.
254	332	Suresh Pal Singh S/G	Sunny Tomar	01-04-1995	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject properties, valued at Rs. 5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 4.6 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
255	469	Raj Singh Mate	Surender	27-10-1995	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that the applicant failed to disclose the status of a 75 sq. yds. residential property in Bahadurgarh, Haryana, as reported in the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 05.12.2015. It is also noted that the widow had earlier submitted an affidavit stating that the total property measures 150 sq. yds. and was registered in the name of her late husband, out of which her share is 75 sq. yds., while the remaining share belongs to her sister.
256	453	Jai Singh Driver	Surender Singh	06-10-1983	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's submissions contain multiple discrepancies and omissions. The 2019 affidavit and Welfare Inspection report recorded the applicant's sister, Ms. Babli, as married, whereas the latest affidavit states she is unmarried. The applicant, employed with NITCON Ltd., has declared a nil bank balance without any documentation and the required ID cards of dependents have not been submitted.
257	27	Aan Singh Beldar	Surender Singh Bisht	25-04-1984	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
258	328	Vijay Pal S/G	Sushil	08-01-1981	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)

259	345	Suresh Kumar S/G	Tarun Sharma	24-01-1987	The Screening Committee rejected the case on the ground that, while the 2019 affidavit declared the full value of parental property as ₹29.4 lakh, the current affidavit records only a 1/7th share amounting to ₹3.85 lakh without providing any supporting documentation. Furthermore despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
260	343	Rohtash Vashisht Mate	Tinku Sharma	08-06-1986	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that the applicant has declared a nil bank balance and has not disclosed any cash in hand, despite such disclosure being specifically required under the prescribed proforma. Further, although the applicant is stated to be employed with NITCON, no supporting documents relating to the bank balance or financial status have been furnished. The absence of mandatory financial details and supporting documentation raises serious concerns regarding the accuracy, completeness, and credibility of the financial disclosures made in the application.
261	360	Randhir Singh Mali	Titu Ram	05-09-1994	The committee rejected the case due to incomplete and inconsistent information, specifically that in the 2019 affidavit the family declared ownership of a residential property at WZ-719/C-3, Naraina, New Delhi valued at Rs. 5.55 lakh, whereas in the current 2025 affidavit the value of the said property has not been disclosed, and although the applicant has submitted a rent agreement, no information has been provided regarding the present status of the previously declared property, including whether it has been sold or rented out.
262	256	Ravi Prakash Driver	Trijesh Kumar	18-12-1996	The application was rejected as the submitted documents were not properly executed. The NOC is unsigned by the family members, and the affidavit has not been signed by the applicant.
263	436	Jagdish Singh S/G	Uday Bhan Singh	01-07-1988	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 16.06.2015, the family owns agricultural land measuring 5 biswa in Village Pure Chatta Singh, District Rai Bareli, Uttar Pradesh, as well as a residential property measuring 30-35 sq. yds., with the widow holding a 100% share. Furthermore, the applicant had earlier stated the value of the residential property as ₹1.5 lakh in 2019 affidavit; however, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has failed to provide the current status of the above properties.
264	420	Virendra Kumar Sharma UDC	Udit Sharma	03-12-1991	The committee rejected the case due to submission of false information, as the applicant declared that the family was not receiving any pension, whereas the record shows receipt of a basic pension of Rs. 11,100 per month
265	238	Gyan Dutt Yadav Beldar	Umakant Yadav	15-03-1983	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that, as per the 2019 affidavit, the applicant owned two properties. However, in the 2025 affidavit, the applicant has provided the status and valuation of only one property. The current affidavit does not disclose the value or status of the second property previously declared, thereby rendering the submission incomplete.
266	28	Kali Charan Mali	Umesh	22-08-2000	The Committee rejected the case on account of an incomplete application, as the applicant disclosed his residence in an unauthorized area but failed to submit any substantiating documentation or proof regarding the status of the said area. Furthermore, no valuation of the said property was provided by the applicant.
267	303	Virender Mali	Umesh	01-09-1995	The committee rejected the case as the applicant omitted the status of cash in movable property thus rendering the affidavit incomplete

268	353	Samai Mali	Ved Prakash	01-08-1991	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that, as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 28.01.2013, the family owns a residential property situated at E-24/49, Jai Bharti Camp, East Vinod Nagar, Delhi, in which the widow holds full share ownership. The report further records ownership of an additional 40 sq. yds. residential property in the native village/home town. Further, in the affidavit submitted in 2019, the value of the aforesaid property was declared as ₹85,000/-. However, in the current affidavit, the applicant has stated that the said property belongs to his parents and provided a nil valuation. This contradictory disclosure creates ambiguity regarding the ownership and status of the property and raises concerns about the accuracy and credibility of the information furnished by the applicant. Moreover, applicant did not submit NOC in r/o Ms.Rekha who was earlier mentioned in SMC, Welfare Inspector report.
269	355	Raj Singh Peon	Veerendra Kumar	09-04-1991	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 7 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
270	137	Suraj Mal Safai Karamchari	Vicky	04-04-1993	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed education qualification criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025
271	414	Kishan Mali	Vicky	04-02-1994	The Committee rejected this case on the grounds that the Applicant's submission is incomplete, as the bank balance has not been mentioned in the affidavit despite the applicant being employed with NITCON Ltd. Further the rent agreement lacks witness signature and rent slips, as required, were also not provided thus rendering the affidavit incomplete.
272	481	Hari Ram S/G	Vicky	27-03-1989	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
273	478	Dharambir Singh Mate	Vicky Mann	23-02-1997	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's submissions are false and incomplete, as the applicant has declared himself unemployed despite being employed with NITCON Ltd. and engaged in DDA, the subject property valued at Rs. 4.5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit is now shown as a rented property without any information regarding its sale or status, and the rent agreement lacks the signature of a witness
274	217	Vikram Singh Lift Operator	Vijay	21-10-1983	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
275	501	Rajendra Mali	Vijay	05-02-1991	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 3.5 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 2.5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility. Further, as per the Welfare Inspector's report dated 22.03.2014, the family owns a residential property measuring 120 sq. yds. in Sikri Kalan, with the widow holding a 100% share. However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has disclosed only an ancestral property measuring 30 sq. yds. in Sikri Kalan and has provided the value of the same, without furnishing any details regarding the remaining property.
276	21	Hardas Mali	Vijay Pal	14-12-1989	The Committee rejected the case on the ground that, as per the Welfare Inspector's Report dated 18.07.2016, the family owned a residential property bearing No. P-1/745, Sultan Puri, measuring 25 sq. yds., in which the widow had full ownership. However, in the affidavit submitted in 2025, the applicant has not disclosed the status of this property.

277	69	Swaraj Singh Garden Supervisor	Vijay Singh	28-08-1988	The Committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant's residential address was inconsistently reported, with the affidavit listing C-2/300, Nand Nagri, Delhi-110093 while the rent agreement reflected C-1/245, Nand Nagri, Delhi-110093; additionally, the status of the property at C-2/300 as declared in the affidavit was not clarified, and although the applicant stated that it is owned by his parents/grandparents in a Jhuggi Jhopri area, no valuation was provided, rendering the submission inconsistent and incomplete.
278	413	Tej Pal	Vijay Singh	07-08-1991	The committee rejected the case due to the observation that, as per the 2019 affidavit, the applicant had declared a property (House No. E-12/77, Loni, ghaziabad) with a valuation of Rs. 6.15 lakh however, in the current affidavit, the applicant has provided valuation of a different property (House No. 1056, Loni, ghaziabad) without any clarification regarding House No. E-12/77 as to whether it is still in possession or has been sold
279	461	Attar Singh Mali	Vijender Singh	16-05-1983	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
280	93	Shiv Kumar OCM	Vikas	10-10-1989	In the 2019 affidavit, the applicant declared ownership of property bearing H. No. 321, valued at ₹2.5 lakh. However, in the current affidavit, the applicant has neither disclosed the status of the said property (i.e., whether it remains in his possession or has been sold) nor provided any supporting details. Furthermore, the applicant has stated in the present affidavit that he is residing at H. No. 104, Harewali, Delhi; however, a property valuation of ₹5 lakh has been declared for property bearing H. No. 102, Harewali, Delhi, without providing any clarification regarding the status of other two properties. Accordingly, the Committee has rejected the case on account of suppression of material information and inconsistencies in the applicant's declarations.
281	147	Ramesh Chander Beldar (W/C)	Vikas	12-02-1989	The committee rejected the case as the applicant's claim of residing in a rental property could not be substantiated. Although a rent agreement was submitted, the welfare inspector's report dated 14.02.2014 (countersigned by the applicant) recorded a 100 sq. yds. house owned by the widow in the same village, despite the claim that 50 sq. yds. was on unauthorized land, the remaining 50 sq. yds. constitutes a property asset whose valuation was not disclosed. Furthermore, Electricity bill in the name of widow was found in the file for the property which is mentioned as rental accommodation in 2025 affidavit
282	200	Indra Pal Khallasi	Vikas	18-08-1993	The committee rejected the case due to submission of false information, as the applicant declared that the family was not receiving any pension, whereas the record shows receipt of a basic pension of Rs. 9,000 per month
283	125	Raghubir Singh S/G	Vikas Dabas	12-11-1989	In the 2019 affidavit, the applicant declared a property at Ladpur, Delhi with a valuation of ₹5 lakh. However, in the current affidavit, the same property is shown as rented accommodation, and a nil valuation has been declared. No information has been provided as to whether the property was sold as required by the notification, nor have any supporting details been furnished. Furthermore, in Table at Sr. No. 11 of Annexure B of the affidavit, the applicant has omitted entries pertaining to cash, bank balances, and furniture, and has not provided their current status. In view of these omissions and inconsistencies, the Committee has rejected the case.
284	313	Chander Pal J.E	Vikas Kumar	20-02-1988	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
285	189	Rajendra Prasad Beldar	Vikram Kumar	21-06-1988	The Committee rejected the case on the ground of incomplete and contradictory submission. The applicant is residing in a rented property however the rent agreement submitted lacks the required witness signatures. Furthermore applicant's brother SH. Gaurav who is also residing with the applicant is shown as employed however total family income is stated as nil.

286	58	Nanak Chand S/G	Vinod Kumar	13-11-1992	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that the applicant has shown himself to be employed and earning Rs. 8000 per month and despite that the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
287	138	Rajbir Singh Pump Operator	Vinod Kumar Jayant	14-02-1980	The committee has disqualified the candidate for failing to meet the prescribed age criteria established in the notification dated 30.05.2025 (overage)
288	450	Siya Ram Mali	Vinod Kumar Yadav	25-06-1990	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
289	314	Manohar Lal Assistant	Vipin Kumar	27-09-1993	The committee rejected the case on account of suppression of material information and submission of incomplete documents. The rent agreement submitted by the applicant was found to be deficient, as it did not bear the signature of any witness. Further, the Welfare Inspector's report dated 29.04.2010 recorded that the family owned a house measuring 100 sq. yds. at Bijwasan, Delhi, in which the widow held a 100% share. However, the applicant failed to furnish any clarification regarding the present status of the said property, i.e., whether it has been sold or is still in the possession of the family. Moreover, the Aadhaar card submitted in respect of the applicant's brother was incomplete, as the residential address portion was missing.
290	448	Ramphal Sharma Beldar	Virender	05-03-1990	The committee rejected the case due to the contradictory statement submitted by the applicant in the affidavit wherein he had declared himself as married and unmarried in the same affidavit.
291	133	Satish Kumar OCM	Vishal Kumar	06-01-1994	The committee rejected the case on the grounds that, despite being an employee of NITCON Ltd., the applicant declared a nil bank balance without any supporting document.
292	128	Rishi Pal S/G	Vishal Malik	08-06-1999	The committee rejected the case due to the applicant's failure to disclose the sale value of property, which was valued at Rs. 15,00,000/- in a 2019 affidavit and reportedly sold in 2021; furthermore, the submission was deemed inconsistent as the current affidavit indicates the applicant continues to reside at the same address on a rental basis without providing supporting financial documentation of the transaction.
293	384	Satpal Singh Beldar	Yogender	27-01-1987	The committee rejected the case due to an unexplained discrepancy in asset valuation. The subject property, valued at Rs. 7.4 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 2.5 lakh in the 2025 affidavit. In the absence of documented justification for this depreciation, the disclosure lacks financial credibility.
294	382	Ramesh Chand Beldar	Yogesh	05-06-1993	The committee rejected the case due to multiple discrepancies in the records, including a biological impossibility wherein the recorded date of birth of the applicant's sister, Poonam, indicates she is four months older than her father as well as an inconsistency between the recorded birth dates of two other daughters showing an implausible gap of only five months, additionally the subject property, valued at Rs. 2 lakh in the 2019 affidavit, was reported at a lower valuation of Rs. 1.75 lakh in the 2025 affidavit without any documented justification for this depreciation.

Sd/-

List of documents required for document verification

1. Aadhaar Card & PAN Card of applicant in original and photocopy
2. ID Proof of dependents in original and photocopy
3. Category Certificate, if any
4. Educational Qualification documents both in original and photocopy
5. 3 months Bank Statement covering crucial date of 31.05.2025 either attested by bank manager or updated passbook
6. Property papers mentioning the area under possession of the dependents/family of the deceased employee alongwith proof regarding the circle rate either online or physical copy attested by revenue officer
7. Candidates listed in Annexure 2 must also submit the specific documentation or proof required for their respective cases.

Sd/-