

\$~27

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

+ W.P.(C) 8173/2018 & C.M. No.31302-03/2018 (exemption)

AJAY KUMAR SINGH AND ANR. Petitioner

Through Mr.Sandeep Kumar Dwivedi, Adv.
with Mr.Satyam Pandey, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents

Through Mr.Abhey Prakash Sahay, Adv. with
Mr.Vinod Tewary, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

%

06.08.2018

1. The present misconceived petition has been filed by the petitioners, two in number, alleging *inter alia* that on 10.09.1993, they were selected for appointment to the post of Constable in the CRPF and were subsequently sent for training. It is the petitioners' further case that on 31.12.1993, an illegal termination order was passed against them by the appointing authority without following any procedure prescribed in law. After two decades, the petitioners claim to have met the appointing authority and explained their case but on not receiving any positive response, in the year 2015, the petitioners adopted the RTI route to gather some information which the respondent/CRPF declined to supply to them, by claiming

privilege. In August, 2017, the petitioners approached the High Court at Allahabad for relief by filing a writ petition which we are informed, was dismissed for want of territorial jurisdiction. After waiting for another year, the petitioners have filed the present petition, seeking to agitate an issue that had attained a quietus in the year 1993.

2. We may note, even the termination order that was passed in respect of the petitioners had clearly stated that their “*engagement had been terminated on completion of the engagement term*”. Moreover, the reply dated 18.10.2016 by the respondents to an application submitted by the petitioner no.1 had also clarified that as per the records, he was appointed on a contractual basis, as an ad hoc employee on 10.10.1993 and his services were terminated at the end of the contract period, on 31.12.1993.

3. In view of the above facts, we are of the opinion that the present petition being hopelessly barred by delay and laches, ought not to be entertained. The same is accordingly dismissed *in limine*, along with the application.

HIMA KOHLI, J

REKHA PALLI, J

AUGUST 06, 2018/aa