

\$~A-9,10,11,14,15,16&19

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

9

+ W.P. (C) 8199/2019

BISWAJIT ROYPetitioner

Through: Mr. K B Upadhyay, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANRRespondents

Through: Ms. Suman Chauhan, Advocate.

Ms. Anju Gupta, Advocate for UOI.

10

+ W.P. (C) 9287/2020, CM APPL. 29956/2020

BHAGIRATHPetitioner

Through: Mr. K B Upadhyay, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Arnav Kumar, Senior Panel
(UOI).

Ms. Anju Gupta, Advocate for UOI.

11

+ W.P. (C) 10790/2019, CM APPL. 44578/2019

KAVENDRA SINGHPetitioner

Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Anju Gupta, Advocate for UOI.

14

+ W.P. (C) 12925/2019, CM APPL. 52736/2019

ALOK PATELPetitioner

Through: Mr. K B Upadhyay, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Jitendra Kumar Tripathi,
Advocate with Mr. Suraj Kumar GP.
Mr. Kamal Kant Jha and
Ms. Sheetal Raghuvanshi, Advocates.
Ms. Anju Gupta, Advocate for UOI.

15

+ W.P. (C) 12929/2019, CM APPL. 52740/2019

HARJEET SINGHPetitioner

Through: Mr. K B Upadhyay, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Kamal Kant Jha and
Ms. Sheetal Raghuvanshi, Advocates.
Ms. Anju Gupta, Advocate for UOI.

16

+ W.P. (C) 12958/2019, CM APPL. 52829/2019

AMIT HANSDAPetitioner

Through: Mr. K B Upadhyay, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Kamal Kant Jha and
Ms. Sheetal Raghuvanshi, Advocates.
Ms. Anju Gupta, Advocate for UOI.

19

+ W.P. (C) 218/2020, CM APPL. 691/2020

AJAY KUMAR SINGHPetitioner

Through: Mr. K B Upadhyay, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. D S Mehandru, Advocate.
Ms. Anju Gupta, Advocate for UOI.

%

Date of Decision: 01st March, 2021

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ASHA MENON

J U D G M E N T

MANMOHAN, J (Oral):

1. The petitions have been heard by way of video conferencing.
2. Present writ petitions have been filed challenging show cause notices issued by the respondent No. 3 (Sashastra Seema Bal).
3. Learned counsel for the respondents raises preliminary objections to the maintainability of the present writ petitions on the ground that they are premature as they assail only show cause notices. He further submits that in the event an adverse order is passed against the petitioners in pursuance to the show cause notices, the petitioners have alternative effective remedy of filing statutory appeals under Rule 29 of the Sashastra Seema Bal Rules, 2009.
4. In view of the aforesaid, learned counsel for the petitioners states that he would be satisfied in the event this Court were to direct that if termination orders are passed in pursuance to the impugned show cause notices, the same shall not be given effect to for a period of two weeks, so that the petitioner can avail of the statutory remedy.
5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court directs that the respondents shall pass a reasoned order disposing of the show cause notices within two weeks. However, in the event the services of the petitioners are terminated, then the said order shall not be given effect to for two weeks, during which time, the petitioners shall be at liberty to file statutory appeals under Rule 29 of Shasatra Seema Bal Rules, 2009. This

Court clarifies that it has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the controversy. All the rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

6. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petitions along with pending applications stand disposed of. Interim orders, if any, stand vacated.

7. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith. Copy of the order be also forwarded to the learned counsel through e-mail.

MANMOHAN, J

ASHA MENON, J

MARCH 01, 2021

TS



न्यायमेव जयते