



\$~8, 10 to 17

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

Date of decision: 30.07.2025

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| + | W.P.(C) 10233/2023 & CM APPL. 39600/2023
UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.
versus
MANOJ KUMAR |Petitioners

.....Respondent |
| + | W.P.(C) 10228/2023 & CM APPL. 39590/2023
UNION OF INDIA AND ANR
versus
HARKESH MEENA |Petitioners

.....Respondent |
| + | W.P.(C) 10230/2023 & CM APPL. 39594/2023
UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.
versus
RAKESH KUMAR |Petitioners

.....Respondent |
| + | W.P.(C) 12741/2023 & CM APPL. 50233/2023
UNION OF INDIA & ANR.
versus
SANDEEP KUMAR |Petitioners

.....Respondent |
| + | W.P.(C) 13025/2023 & CM APPL. 51474/2023
UNION OF INDIA & ANR.
versus
SUNIL KUMAR |Petitioners

.....Respondent |
| + | W.P.(C) 13494/2023 & CM APPL. 53285/2023
UNION OF INDIA & ANR.
versus
LALIT BANSAL |Petitioners

.....Respondent |



2025:DHC:6244-DB



- + **W.P.(C) 13520/2023 & CM APPL. 53376/2023, CM APPL. 72401/2024**
UNION OF INDIA THROUGH THE SECRETARY
MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY & ANR.Petitioners
versus
SATISH KUMAR MEENARespondent
- + **W.P.(C) 13522/2023 & CM APPL. 53427/2023, CM APPL. 72382/2024**
UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.Petitioners
versus
BHEEM SINGH MEENARespondent
- + **W.P.(C) 13545/2023 & CM APPL. 53541/2023, CM APPL. 72270/2024**
UNION OF INDIA THROUGH THE SECRETARY
MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY & ANR.Petitioners
versus
RAJESH MEENARespondent

Present for the petitioners:

Ms.Nidhi Raman, CGSC for UOI with
Mr.Arn timer Mittal, Adv
Mr.Siddhartha Sinha, SPC for Union

Present for the respondents:

Mr.Prateek Dhanda, Adv
Mr.Banka Bihari Panda, Mr.Lokesh
Bharti, Adv
Mr.Jatin Parashar, Mr.Prateek Dhanda
& Mr.Rohit Bhagat

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)**

1. These petitions have been filed challenging the orders passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (in short, 'Tribunal'). As they raise similar issues, they have been taken up together. For sake of convenience, the OA numbers, the date of the Impugned Order and the corresponding Writ Petitions numbers are being given in a form of a table hereinbelow:-

Writ Petition No.	O.A. No.	Date of the Order
W.P.(C) 10233/2023	1636/2019	23.11.2022
W.P.(C) 10228/2023	1639/2019	23.11.2022
W.P.(C) 10230/2023	1640/2019	23.11.2022
W.P.(C) 12741/2023	1635/2019	06.03.2023
W.P.(C) 13025/2023	464/2020	09.02.2023
W.P.(C) 13494/2023	318/2020	08.02.2023
W.P.(C) 13520/2023	761/2019	08.02.2023
W.P.(C) 13522/2023	765/2019	08.02.2023
W.P.(C) 13545/2023	764/2019	08.02.2023

2. By the Impugned Orders, the learned Tribunal has allowed the OA(s) and has set aside the orders terminating the services of the respondents. The learned Tribunal has further remitted the inquiry back to the competent authority with a direction to reinstate the respondents, however, reserving liberty to take further action against them, if so advised, strictly in accordance with law and the provisions of the rules governing the subject.

3. We need not dwell into details of the facts and submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties, for the reason that for a similar selection process and in a challenge to similar orders, this Court, in ***Union of India & Ors. v. Sanjeev Kumar & Anr.***,



2024:DHC:5282-DB, has dismissed the challenge of the petitioners herein, *inter alia*, holding therein that the orders terminating the services of the respondent were stigmatic in nature and were not simpliciter orders of termination of services during the probationary period, rather they were based on an allegation that the respondents had adopted unfair means in the recruitment process by impersonation; the same attaches a stigma on the respondent and shall cause them great prejudice even in matters of future employment efforts. The Court held that, therefore, they were to be offered a reasonable opportunity of establishing that the allegations against them are false, however, as no departmental inquiry was conducted against them, the termination orders could not be sustained. This Court further observed that mere reliance on the FSL report for terminating the services of the respondents may not be sufficient. The Court finally concluded as under:-

“19. To conclude, the present respondents had already joined services after being declared successful in the recruitment process but their services were terminated under probation period by way of a detailed stigmatic order without conducting a departmental enquiry and that too on the basis of only a weak piece of evidence in the form of unproved FSL report, therefore, termination of services of the present respondents cannot be sustained.”

4. The above Judgment of this Court has been upheld by the Supreme Court *vide* its Order dated 16.12.2024, passed in SLP (C) bearing Diary No. 55214/2024.

5. The above Judgment was followed by this Court in ***Union of***



2025:DHC:6244-DB



India & Ors. v. Shri Sukhvinder, 2024:DHC:6636-DB, which Judgment was again upheld by the Supreme Court *vide* its Order dated 03.01.2025 passed in SLP (C) bearing Diary No. 55633/2024.

6. Though the learned counsels for the petitioners have sought to distinguish the above Judgments, however, we find that the Judgments squarely apply to the facts of the case as the respondents have participated in a similar recruitment process as the respondents in the above petitions, and their services have been terminated in a similar manner and for the same reasons as the respondents therein.

7. Accordingly, we find no merit in the present petitions. The same, along with the pending applications, are dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

JULY 30, 2025/rv/ik