

\$~9

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

+ W.P.(C) 5694/2016

SUBHASH AND ANR Petitioners

Through Mr.P.Sureshan, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS Respondents

Through Ms.Sangita Rai, Adv. CGSC, Ms.
Sunila Singh and Mr. Pradeep Singh
Tomar, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SISTANI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.S.TEJI

ORDER

% **20.06.2016**

C.M.Nos.23543-44/2016

Allowed subject to all just exceptions.

The applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 5694/2016

The petitioners being husband and wife who are working for the CISF are aggrieved by the communication dated 19th May, 2016 by which their request for permission to reside outside the campus has been declined. The petitioners submit that the petitioner no. 2 is on the family way and there are various constraints in residing in the campus including the constraint of proper food, congenial environment and the appropriate diet required for a woman who is on the family way. Counsel further submits that no reasons

have been given for declining the request whereas in the past such requests have been acceded to.

Learned counsel for the respondent who enters appearance on an advance notice submits that the present petition is premature as the representation of the petitioner is pending. She further submits that the representation would be decided within ten days from today positively.

Heard.

We expect that the request of the petitioners would be considered sympathetically and in accordance with law within ten days from today.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner wishes to withdraw this petition with leave to file fresh petition in accordance with law if the representation is rejected.

Copy of the order be given dasti to the parties.

G.S.SISTANI
(VACATION JUDGE)

P.S.TEJI
(VACATION JUDGE)

JUNE 20, 2016

mr