

\$~12

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 8020/2018**
SANJAY KUMAR CHAUHAN Petitioner
Through: Mr. P.C. Mishra, Advocate.
versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Arun Kumar, Advocate with
Mr. Dhruva, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

% 03.08.2018

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner praying *inter alia* for issuing directions to the respondents/CRPF to consider his representation dated 25.4.2018 and for permission to rejoin service.
2. The admitted facts of the case are that the petitioner was recruited in the CRPF as a Constable/GD in the year 2002. In April, 2010, the petitioner had sought leave for one month, which was granted. He was required to report back on 19.5.2010. The petitioner claims that when he went to his native place, he got involved in a quarrel and FIR No. 371/2010 dated 03.10.2010 was registered against him and 24 others. It appears that the petitioner neither informed the respondents about registration of the FIR against him or the status of the proceedings arising therefrom. Nor did the petitioner seek leave of absence from the respondents. The next averment made in the petition is that on 25.1.2014, the petitioner was acquitted by the court of the learned ACM-I, Aligarh. The petition is silent on what steps

he had taken thereafter to approach the respondents, till he submitted a representation in the year 2018.

3. We may note that no copy of the order passed by the learned ACM-I, Aligarh, has been annexed with this petition, much less a copy of the FIR referred to above. After waiting for eight years reckoned from 19.05.2010 and four and a half years reckoned from 25.01.2014, the petitioner has woken up to file the present petition, praying *inter alia* that the respondents/CRPF may be directed to consider his representation dated 25.4.2018, for being reinstated in the CRPF.

4. We have perused the said representation and find the same bereft of material particulars with regard to steps taken by him on expiry of a period of one month, reckoned from 18.4.2010 when he was granted leave for one month by the respondents. Nor did the petitioner inform the respondents/CRPF for seeking leave in that duration. After waiting for over eight years, the petitioner has decided to approach this court for seeking relief and that too without any sufficient cause to explain the inordinate delay.

5. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, we decline to entertain the present petition, which is dismissed hopelessly barred by delay and *laches*.

HIMA KOHLI, J

REKHA PALLI, J

AUGUST 03, 2018

ap/na
W.P.(C) 8020/2018