

\$~8

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 5834/2018**
SURESH KUMAR Petitioner
Through: Mr. Jitendra Singh, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Jagjit Singh and Mr. Preet Singh,
Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

% **ORDER**
28.05.2018

1. This is the second petition filed by the petitioner on the same cause of action. Earlier hereto, the petitioner had filed W.P.(C) No. 511/2018, praying inter alia that he be appointed to the post of Motor Driver, Grade-I. At that time, in the order dated 19.01.2018, this court had expressed a *prima facie* view that the Notification for filling up the post of Motor Driver was issued by the respondent No.1 in the year 2015 whereas the writ petition was filed by the petitioner in the year 2018 and it appeared to be highly belated. After addressing arguments for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner had sought leave to withdraw the said petition while reserving the right of his client to approach the Department for relief.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner had thereafter submitted a detailed representation dated 20.1.2018 to the Chief Security Commissioner/Inspector General, Railway Protection Force,
W.P.(C) 5834/2018

Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh, but the same did not elicit any reply. Thereafter, a legal notice dated 23.1.2018 was served on behalf of the petitioner on the respondents at Allahabad and at the Headquarters at Delhi. Yet again, the respondents failed to give a reply. Hence, the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents, who appears on an advance notice, states that the UP Branch of the respondents have replied to the petitioner's representation.

4. As learned counsel for the petitioner states that his client has not received a copy of the reply so far, another copy thereof be furnished directly to the counsel for the petitioner. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the decision taken by the respondents, then he is at liberty to approach the competent court vested with territorial jurisdiction to entertain the petition.

5. The petition is disposed of.

HIMA KOHLI, J

PRATIBHA RANI, J

MAY 28, 2018

ap/rkb