

\$~22

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

+ W.P.(C) 4675/2017

K.S. CHOUHAN & ORS Petitioners
Through Mr.Ankur Chhibber, Adv.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS Respondents
Through Mr.Vivek Goyal, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

% **27.08.2018**

C.M. No.34325/2018 (for extension of time for implementation of order dt.10.01.2018)

1. The present application has been filed by the respondent nos.2 & 3, seeking extension of time for making compliances of the order dated 10.01.2018, whereunder, learned counsel for the respondents had sought four months' time to take a decision on the proposal received from the respondent nos.2 & 3/Border Security Force, for reviewing the Stenographers cadre in the BSF. While allowing the timeline as prayed for on behalf of respondent no.1 and binding the said respondent thereto, the petition was disposed of.

2. The period of four months reckoned from 10.01.2018, had expired on 09.05.2018. The respondent no. 1 took no steps to

approach the Court for extension of time or to apprise this Court about the status of the proposal received from the respondent nos.2 & 3/BSF, for reviewing the Stenographers' cadre. After waiting for another four months, reckoned from 09.05.2018, the present application has been filed asking for extension of time without expressly stating how much more time would be required to complete the exercise. In other words, respondent no.1 wants an open ended timeline to make compliances of the order dated 10.01.2018, which is impermissible.

3. At this stage, Mr.Chhibber, learned counsel for the petitioners states that but for the fact that the petitioners had filed a contempt petition against the respondents in May, 2018 on which notice was issued, returnable on 26.10.2018, they would have continued to sleep over the matter.

4. We have requested learned counsel for the respondents to explain the steps taken by the respondent no.1/Union of India effective from 10.01.2018, to complete the process of cadre review of Stenographers in the BSF, as the present application does not throw any light on the aforesaid aspect.

5. Mr.Goyal, learned counsel for the respondents states that he may be granted time to file an affidavit on behalf of the respondent no.1 explaining the steps taken by the Ministry over the past eight months. The said affidavit shall be filed by a senior officer of the respondent no.1/Ministry of Home Affairs, conversant with the facts of the case. Needful shall be done within two weeks with a copy to

counsel for the petitioners.

6. List on 27.09.2018.

HIMA KOHLI, J

REKHA PALLI, J

AUGUST 27, 2018/gm