



\$~23

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9866/2020 & CM APPL. 32505/2021**

**DR. A K SINGLA**

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate.**

versus

**UNION OF INDIA AND ORS**

.....Respondent

Through: **Mr. Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with  
Ms. Priya Singh, GP & Mr.  
Nishant Sharma & Mr. Nipun Jain,  
Advocates for UOI.**

**Mr. Aditya Singla & Mr. Raghav  
Bakshi, Advocates for R-4.**

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN**

**ORDER**

**%**

**10.01.2025**

1. The petitioner has instituted this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, challenging an order dated 29.09.2020, by which the respondent-Union of India rejected his contention that he was entitled to remain in service of the respondent upto the age of 65 years.
2. During the pendency of this petition, the petitioner has, in fact, attained the age of 65 years on 31.01.2023.
3. In these circumstances, Mr. Rajeev Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioner, states that the petition has been rendered infructuous.
4. The petition, alongwith pending application, is therefore disposed of.

**PRATEEK JALAN, J**

**JANUARY 10, 2025/'pv'/kb/**