

\$~28.

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

+ W.P.(C) No.3963/2015

MANJU PANDEY

..... Petitioner

Through: Counsel for the petitioner (appearance
not given).

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Suparna Srivastav, Standing
Counsel with Mr. Raghav Kapoor and
Mr. Manu Dev Sharma, Advs. for
UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

03.05.2016

**CM No.16237/2016 (of the petitioner for clarification of the order dated
31st March, 2016).**

1. The petitioner seeks clarification of the judgment dated 31st March, 2016 disposing of the writ petition by seeking a direction to the respondents to complete the departmental inquiry in a time bound manner and by defining the scope of the departmental inquiry and to provide that a copy of the report of the departmental inquiry to the petitioner and also be placed before this Court.
2. There is no basis for the apprehension that the departmental inquiry would be delayed. The same cannot be assumed and I am confident that the same will be completed expeditiously.
3. Similarly, it is not for this Court to define the scope of departmental inquiry.

4. To the same effect, there is no reason to doubt that upon the petitioner applying for a copy of the report of the departmental inquiry and/or of the final decision on the basis thereof the same will not be provided to the petitioner.

5. The argument, of there being no prejudice to the respondents in issuing the directions sought, is of no avail inasmuch as the petitioner, to be entitled to a relief, has to show a cause of action entitlement and no orders can be passed merely for the reason that no prejudice would be caused to the respondents thereby.

6. The application is thus dismissed but with liberty to the petitioner to if in future any cause of action arises, take appropriate remedies in this respect.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

MAY 03, 2016

‘pp’..