

\$~7

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

+ W.P.(C) 3787/2014

ONKAR SINGH

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr.V.K.Sharma, Advocate

versus

THE DIRECTOR, C.I.S.F. (HEADQUARTERS),

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND ORS

..... Respondents

Represented by: Mr.Himanshu Anand Gupta,
Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP NANDRAJOG

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

28.07.2016

1. Inchoate pleadings in the writ petition do not bring out a proper cause of action. Somewhere the petitioner makes averments of being superseded for promotion and somewhere the averments relate to denial of the benefit under the MACP scheme.
2. The two are entirely distinct causes of action and thus the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the writ petition with right reserved to file two separate writ petitions-one pertaining to claim in MACP scheme and the other to being superseded for promotion.
3. Granting liberty as prayed for the writ petition is dismissed as not pressed.

PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

JULY 28, 2016/ 'pg'