

\$~47

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9339/2016**

JITENDER SINGH & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Tuhin Batra, Mr.Arun Vir Singh
and Mr.Piyush Gupta, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Ankur Chhibber, Adv. for R1

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV KHANNA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SUNITA GUPTA

ORDER

%

07.10.2016

Counsel for the respondents who has appeared on an advance notice has referred to Section 14 of Central Administrative Act 1985 and submits that the present writ petition should not be entertained. Questions in relation to matters concerning recruitment should be raised before the Central Administrative Tribunal at the first instance. Reliance is placed on the judgment of a single Judge of this Court in W.P.(C) No.498/2006 dated 20.06.2007 titled as Praveen Sharma vs. UPSC.

The petitioner has challenged the maximum age limit of unreserved general category candidate of 21 years, as stipulated in the notification dated 10.09.2016 for the post of Constable (Exe.) Male. Validity of Recruitment Rule (9) (v) (a) of the Delhi Police Appointment and the Recruitment (Rules), 1980, which prescribes the said age limit is also challenged.

In view of the aforesaid section, the petitioner have to and must first invoke the statutory remedy as per the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985.

The writ petition therefore, is not entertained without expressing any opinion, with liberty to the petitioner to approach the Tribunal. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands dismissed.

Dasti.

SANJIV KHANNA, J

SUNITA GUPTA, J

OCTOBER 07, 2016

neelam