



\$~57

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

+ **W.P.(C) 11453/2024**

RAHUL SOLANKI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anshul Kumar, Mr. Bhanu
Pratap, Mr. Abhishek Kumar & Mr.
Manish Mishra, Advs.

versus

CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE CRPFRespondent

Through: Mr. Rohan Jaitly, CGSC with Mr.
Hussain Taqvi, Mr. Dev Pratap Shahi,
Mr. Yogya Bhatia, Advs.
Mr. Ajay Pal, AC/Law CRPF.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINDER KAUR

ORDER

% **20.08.2024**

CM APPL. 47534/2024 (exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 11453/2024 & CM APPL.47535/2024

3. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India assailing the order dated 18.06.2024 vide which the petitioner has been relieved from the Group Centre Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF), Greater Noida, with directions to report at the Group Centre CRPF, Sonipat on attachment.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned order has been passed only as a result of the petitioner raising certain issues regarding the irregularities being committed at Group Centre CRPF, Noida.



He, therefore, contends that the impugned order which is punitive in nature be set aside.

5. On the other hand, Mr. Jaitly, learned counsel for the respondents, on advance notice, submits that the petitioner has already joined at the Group Centre CRPF-Sonipat on 19.06.2024 and, therefore, contends that the petition has been rendered infructuous. He, however, assures the Court that the issues regarding the functioning of the Group Centre CRPF, Noida which may have been highlighted by the petitioner will be considered as per law and therefore, prays that the petition be dismissed.

6. Having considered the submissions of learned counsel for the parties, we find that once the petitioner has, in terms of the impugned order, already joined at Group Centre CRPF, Sonipat which is situated merely at a distance of 45 kms from Delhi, there is absolutely no reason to entertain the present petition. In fact, the petitioner has, except for his bald statement that the impugned order is punitive in nature, not been able to raise any ground for this Court to interfere with the administrative decision of the respondents to attach the petitioner at Sonipat.

7. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed. We, however, take on record the statement of respondents that the complaint made by the petitioner regarding the irregularities being committed at the Group Centre CRPF, Noida will be considered in accordance with law.

REKHA PALLI, J

SHALINDER KAUR, J

AUGUST 20, 2024

ab