

\$~21.

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 6371/2021
HC/GD KARTAR SINGH AND ORS Petitioners
Through: Ms. Ankita Patnaik, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. J.P.N. Shahi, Sr. Panel Counsel.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

% **ORDER**
12.07.2021

[VIA VIDEO CONFERENCING]

CM No.20032/2021 (for exemption from filing typed and fair copies of the annexures, court fees and welfare stamp and attested affidavit).

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions and as per extant rules.
2. The application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 6371/2021 & CM No.20031/2021 (for stay).

3. The ninety three personnel of the respondents Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) have filed this petition, impugning the notices dated 11th June, 2021 and 16th June, 2021 inviting applications for deployment in the upcoming United Nations (UN) Mission in July, 2021 and seeking a mandamus, directing the respondents CRPF to deploy the petitioners in the upcoming UN Mission in July, 2021.
4. It is the case of the petitioners, that (i) pursuant to similar notices taken out by the respondents CRPF in the year 2016, the petitioners had applied and participated in the selection process comprising of written

examination, physical standards, physical efficiency and medical tests and were selected; (ii) the petitioners, on 12th June, 2017 also cleared the Pre-Deployment Training; (iii) the petitioners, from time to time, till the year 2019 also, were subjected to further training for deployment in UN Mission; (iv) however the petitioners were not deployed at any time at any of the UN Missions; (v) owing to the petitioners being so empanelled for deployment in UN Mission, the petitioners have also lost out on postings which would have earned special allowances for the petitioners; and, (vi) however the respondents now, vide impugned notices dated 11th June, 2021 and 16th June, 2021, have invited fresh applications for empanelment for deployment in UN Mission, when the petitioners earlier selected, have remained to be deployed for the last five years.

4. We have informed the counsel for the petitioners, that in the past also, ***Pandu Ranga Vs. Union of India*** MANU/DE/1881/2020 entailing similar issues, had come up before a Bench of one of us (Rajiv Sahai Endlaw J.) sitting with Justice Asha Menon and which had been dismissed, holding that there was no right to posting on empanelment.

5. The counsel for the petitioners states that since the petitioners last underwent training, as recently as in the year 2019, it cannot be said that the petitioners, merely for the reason of having been selected way back in the year 2016, are not fit to be deployed. It is also contended that the petitioners are still within the prescribed age limits and none of the petitioners have become overage for deployment. It is again emphasised that the petitioners, having opted for such empanelment have been deprived of other benefits which would have accrued to them in the last five years.

6. We have considered the aforesaid contentions and do not find any

reason to change the view taken in *Pandu Ranga* supra. The petitioners, merely by being empanelled therefor, did not acquire any right to be posted at UN Mission, whensoever and wheresoever. Moreover, if the petitioners still meet the requirements set out in the impugned notices dated 11th June, 2021 and 16th June, 2021 for empanelment, the petitioners are required to compete with the fresh applicants and if selected, would again be empanelled. Else, it is not for this Court to interfere in such administrative tasks as empanelment for UN Missions.

7. However some merit is found in the argument of the counsel for the petitioners, of the petitioners owing to be so empanelled having missed out on other opportunities. All we can say is, that the respondents CRPF may consider the said aspect, either while selecting the personnel pursuant to the notices dated 11th June, 2021 and 16th June, 2021 or if indeed find the petitioners to have lost out, consider how the petitioners can be compensated therefor.

8. Else, no merit is found in the writ petition.

9. Dismissed.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

AMIT BANSAL, J

JULY 12, 2021
'pp'..