

\$~S-29

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

+ W.P.(C) 11684/2021 & CM APPL. 36159/2021

PANKAJ KUMAR & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sudhir Nandrajog, Sr. Advocate
with Ms. Saahila Lamba, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ripudaman Bhardwaj, Advocate
for UOI with Mr. Sahaj Garg,
Advocate.

%

Date of Decision: 21st October, 2021

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

MANMOHAN, J. (Oral)

1. Present writ petition has been filed by the petitioners challenging the notice issued in June, 2021 by Central Reserve Police Force ('CRPF') for recruitment to the post of Assistant Commandant (Civil/Engineer) in CRPF as well as the order dated 29th October, 2019. Petitioner also challenges the Central Reserve Police Force Engineering Officers (Group A posts) Recruitment Rules, 2018.
2. Learned senior counsel for the Petitioners states that the Petitioners are working in the rank of Assistant Commandant in the executive cadre in CRPF and have joined the same by passing a rigorous exam conducted by UPSC.
3. He states that vide the impugned order dated 29th October, 2019, the Directorate General, CRPF issued an order creating/sanctioning several posts

in Engineering Set-Up/Pioneer Wing of CRPF which included 50 (Group A) posts of Assistant Commandant (Engineering). He further points out that as a consequence of illegal creation/sanction of posts in Engineering Set-Up/Pioneer Wing of CRPF, the respondents have issued a notice for making recruitment to the post of Assistant Commandant (Civil/Engineer) in CRPF.

4. He submits that the creation of Group A posts of Assistant Commandant (Civil/Engineer) and framing of CRPF Engineering Officers (Group A posts) Recruitment Rules, 2018 without the approval of DoPT, Ministry of Finance and UPSC is illegal.

5. A perusal of the paperbook reveals that the petitioners have not made a representation to the respondents before approaching this Court by way of the present writ petition.

6. Accordingly, this Court directs the present writ petition to be treated as a representation to respondent No. 1 who in turn is directed to decide the same by way of a reasoned order in accordance with law within twelve weeks. This Court clarifies that it has not commented on the merits of the controversy. The rights and contentions of all the parties are left open.

7. Consequently, the present writ petition along with pending application stands disposed of.

MANMOHAN, J

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

OCTOBER 21, 2021

TS