

\$~18

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 6605/2016, CM No. 27089/2016**

PRADEEP KUMAR Petitioner
Through: Mr.Shanker Raju, Mr.Nilansh Gaur,
Advs.

versus

INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH & ANR Respondents
Through: Mr.Rajeev Sharma, Mr.Pratishth
Kaushal, Advs. for R-1
Mr.Apoorv Kurup, Mr.A.C.Boxipatro, Advs. for
UGC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER
% **24.04.2017**

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner with the following prayers:-

“(a) Quash and set aside impugned office order dated 6.5.2016 (Annexure P-1) and order in appeal dated 5.7.2016 (Annexure P-2);

(b) Direct the respondents i.e. IEG to reinstate the applicant in service as MTS with all consequential benefits including continuity of service and back wages; and

(c) Any order or further relief which this Hon’ble Court deems fit, just and proper in the peculiar circumstances of the case in the interest of justice may also please be awarded.”

2. In terms of order dated 6th May, 2016, the services of the petitioner as MTS/Library Attendant were terminated. One of the submissions made by Mr.Shanker Raju, learned counsel for the petitioner is that no show cause

notice was issued to the petitioner before the impugned order dated 6th May, 2016 was passed. He raised several grounds against the impugned order. He states, he would be satisfied if on the petitioner making a representation, the same is considered by the respondent no.1.

3. On the other hand, Mr.Rajeev Sharma, learned counsel for respondent no.1 states that the petitioner being a probationer, was not entitled to show cause notice.

4. Be that as it may, as the only issue raised by Mr.Raju is that the petitioner has not been given any show cause notice, this Court without deciding the legality/disturbing the office order dated 6th May, 2016, dispose of the petition by directing the petitioner to make a representation to the respondent no.1 within two weeks from today, taking all such pleas as available to the petitioner both on facts and in law, which shall be considered by respondent no.1 within four weeks thereafter. If the representation of the petitioner is accepted, the necessary consequences shall flow. If the order to be passed is to the prejudice of the petitioner, he shall be at liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law.

5. The petition is disposed of.

CM. No. 27089/2016

Dismissed as infructuous.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

APRIL 24, 2017

RN