

\$~32

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 8279/2018 & C.M.No.31747/2018 (exemption)
JAI SINGH TOMAR Petitioner
Through Mr.B.A.S. Jadon, Adv.

versus

CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE AND ORS Respondent
Through Mr.Vijay Chandra Joshi with
Mr.Pradeep Kumar Jha, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

%

08.08.2018

1. The present petition has been filed under the garb of assailing an order dated 10.03.2018, passed by the Inspector General/CRPF in respect of the representation submitted by the petitioner on 15.07.2017. As a matter of fact, the petitioner seeks to assail the order dated 15.09.2006 passed by the Disciplinary Authority based on the report submitted by the Inquiry Officer on 27.04.2005 and the order dated 19.04.2007, passed by the Appellate Authority upholding the order passed by the Disciplinary Authority imposing a penalty of reduction of his pay by 5 stages from Rs.6,550/- to Rs.5,675/- in the pay scale of Rs. 5,500-175-9,000 for a period of 5 years with effect from the date of issue of this order. By the penalty order dated 27.04.2005, it was further directed that the petitioner would not earn increments of pay during the period of reduction and that on the

W.P.(C) 8279/2018 *page 1 of 2*

expiry of this period, the reduction would have the effect of postponing his future increments of pay.

2. At the outset, we have requested learned counsel for the petitioner to explain the inordinate delay of about 12/13 years in seeking legal recourse against the punishment imposed on him. Admittedly, the petitioner had superannuated some time in June, 2018 and thereafter, it took him almost a decade to file a representation against the order passed by the Appellate Authority on 19.04.2007, which aspect has been noticed in the impugned order dated 10.03.2018 rejecting the petitioner's representation.

3. There is no explanation offered in the writ petition to explain such an inordinate delay in seeking legal recourse nor is learned counsel for the petitioner in a position to explain the said legal position.

4. In view of the above, we decline to entertain the petition at such a belated stage and the same is dismissed as being hopelessly barred by delay and *laches* alongwith the application.

HIMA KOHLI, J

REKHA PALLI, J

AUGUST 08, 2018

sr

