

\$~S-46

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

+ **W.P.(C) 13956/2021**

MANJUNATH GOULI Petitioner

Through **Mr.Krishan Kumar Sharma,**
Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

Through **Mr.Vivek Kumar Singh, DC Law**
with Pairvi Officer, CRPF.

% Date of Decision: 08th December, 2021.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

MANMOHAN, J: (Oral)

C.M.No.44023/2021

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) No.13956/2021

1. Present writ petition has been filed challenging the order dated 23rd July, 2021 passed by Respondent No.2 denying grant of Police Medal for Gallantry [PMG] award for the encounter dated 25th July, 2019. Petitioner also seeks directions to the Respondents to include the Petitioner's name for consideration for the PMG award.

2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner states that the Petitioner is challenging denial of the PMG award for his role in the encounter dated 25th

July, 2019. He states that the Petitioner belongs to CRPF and on 25th July, 2019 he was involved in an operation between the CRPF and armed Naxals due to which his name, along with other force personnel, was recommended for the PMG award, by the unit commandant, vide the detailed report dated 14th August, 2019.

3. He states that even though the Commandant i.e. Respondent No.5 had written a good recommendation and commended the Petitioner's bravery in the incident report, the Petitioner learnt in the month of February 2021 that his name has not been included for the PMG.

4. He states that subsequently the Petitioner communicated his grievances to Respondent No.5 and requested for a court of inquiry to ascertain the reasons for his non-consideration for the PMG award. He states that due to the Petitioner's constant requests, Respondent No.2 issued the impugned order dated 23rd July, 2021, whereby it was stated that the Petitioner's role in the encounter was not up to the level for which his name could be recommended for the PMG award and hence the Petitioner's request was declined.

5. It is the contention of learned counsel for the Petitioner that despite acknowledging the Petitioner's important role in the encounter/operation, his name has been removed from consideration for the PMG award without any reason. He emphasises that the impugned action is discriminatory.

6. In the opinion of this Court, the Petitioner has only a right for consideration of his name for the PMG award but he has no legal right to an award/medal. Further this Court in writ jurisdiction does not confer a gallantry award but it examines only the decision making process and at the highest can only direct the Respondents to consider the Petitioner's request


for an award. In the present instance, Petitioner's name for PMG had been considered and declined by the CRPF at the highest level. Accordingly, this Court does not find any illegality in the decision making process by the Respondents.

7. Consequently, the present writ petition, being bereft of merit, is dismissed.

MANMOHAN, J

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

**DECEMBER 08, 2021
KA**



सत्यमेव जयते