

\$~2, 14 & 15

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

(2) + W.P.(C) 1238/2015 & CM Nos.2182-83/2015

ANIL KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Yajur Bhalla, Proxy for Mr. J.S.
Sandhu, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Kirtiman Singh, Ms. Perna Shah
Deo & Mr. Waize Ali Noor, Adv. for
R-1.
Ms. Anjana Gosain & Mr. Pradeep
Desodya, Adv. for R-2 to 4.

(14) + W.P.(C) 1239/2015 & CM Nos.2184-85/2015

ARUN TOMAR

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Yajur Bhalla, Proxy for Mr. J.S.
Sandhu, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Kirtiman Singh, Ms. Perna Shah
Deo & Mr. Waize Ali Noor, Adv. for
R-1.
Mr. Anjum Javedi & Mr. Devendra
Kumar, Adv. for R-2 to 4.

(15) + W.P.(C) 1241/2015 & CM Nos.2188-89/2015
JATINDER KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Yajur Bhalla, Proxy for Mr. J.S.
Sandhu, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Kirtiman Singh, Ms. Prerna Shah
Deo & Mr. Waize Ali Noor, Advs. for
R-1.
Ms. Sonia Arora & Mr. Jitendra
Kumar Tiwari, Advs. for R-2 to 4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KAILASH GAMBHIR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE I.S. MEHTA

ORDER

%

04.03.2015

CM Nos.2182-83/2015 in W.P.(C) 1238/2015

CM Nos.2184-85/2015 in W.P.(C) 1239/2015

CM Nos.2188-89/2015 in W.P.(C) 1241/2015

Exemption allowed subject to just exceptions.

Applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 1238/2015, W.P.(C) 1239/2015 and W.P.(C) 1241/2015

Today again, the counsel appearing for the petitioner seeks adjournment in these matters on the ground that the main counsel is not available today to address the arguments. Counsel for the respondents submit that this Court has already dismissed one similar petition by order dated 2nd February, 2015 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) 961/2015 titled

4

Shri Rajnikant v. The Commissioner of Police & Anr. and the issue involved in these three cases is also the same, i.e., of fake driving licenses.

Considering the fact that in a similar case this Court has already taken a view that the decision arrived at by the Tribunal is based on the enquiry committed by the Crime Branch of the Delhi Police and, therefore, we find no reason to interfere with the reasoning given by the learned Tribunal. The operative para of the said judgment is reproduced as under:-

“6. The genuineness and authenticity of the driving licence is one of the indispensable conditions for considering the petitioner’s appointment and for assessing his eligibility for the said post. Based on the inquiry report submitted by the Crime Branch, on which the learned Tribunal has placed reliance holding that the licence produced by the petitioner is fake and not genuine, we find no illegality, perversity, or any ground for interfering with the impugned order dated 24.09.2013 passed in O.A . No. 2920/2011 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, the present petition is dismissed.”

It is not in dispute that in these cases their licenses were also found to be fake and ingenuine based on the inquiry report submitted by the Crime Branch and, therefore, the case of these petitioners is not different than that of the case decided by this Court in ***Rajnikant*** (supra).

All these petitions are accordingly dismissed.


KAILASH GAMBHIR, J


J.S. MEHTA, J

MARCH 04, 2015/km