



2025:DHC:8805-DB



\$~91

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

+ **W.P.(C) 14914/2025 & CM APPL. 61362/2025**

SRIKANTA SUTAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhay Kumar Bhargava,
Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

ORDER (ORAL)

% **25.09.2025**

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. Mr. Bhargava, learned Counsel for the petitioner, restricts his relief to compliance, by the respondents, with para 4 of the reasoned and speaking order dated 28 August 2025 annexed as Annexure P-1 to this writ petition. The said para reads thus:

“04. WHEREAS, the petitioner was further apprised during the personal audience dated 22/08/2025, that the post of CT/Carpenter (Med) was abolished in CRPF in the year 2010. Before abolition, four posts @ 1 each were authorized in the 100 bedded Composite Hospitals located at Delhi, Guwahati, Jammu and Hyderabad. As on date, only one CT/Carpenter (Med) is available in the force, who is the last serving individual in this dying cadre. Had the transfer process been carried out through SAMBHAV App /SANTOS portal considering authorization relevant before 2010 i.e. , before the date of abolishing, the petitioner would have been eligible to choose from only three valid options: OH Guwahati, CH Hyderabad and CH Jammu as he has already completed his normal tenure at CH Delhi as per the existing transfer policy. If the petitioner so requests in writing now. the respondent is ready to



2025:DHC:8805-DB



give him the same choice/ options which would have been available to him, had the petitioner's name been included in the SANTOS portal at that given point of time."

2. Mr. Bhargava's prayer is only that, as the order itself permits the petitioner to apply in writing for a posting either at CH Guwahati, CH Hyderabad or CH Jammu, he may be permitted to do so and the respondent directed accordingly to post the petitioner at one of the said places.

3. To a query from the Court as to why the petitioner did not apply in writing as allowed by para 4 of the impugned order, Mr. Bhargava submits that the impugned order was supplied to his client only on 17 September 2025.

4. Accordingly, with the consent of the parties, we dispose of the writ petition in the following terms:

(i) The petitioner would apply in writing to the respondent within one week from today, indicating his choice of posting, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jammu.

(ii) The respondent would make efforts to post the petitioner at one of the said places of posting in the order of preference indicated by him.

(iii) In the event that it is not possible to post the petitioner at one of the preferential places of posting indicated, the reason would be communicated to the petitioner in writing.

(iv) The posting of the petitioner would be decided



2025:DHC:8805-DB



accordingly.

5. Mr. Bhargava undertakes on instructions from his client that his client would abide by the decision taken by the respondent in so far as the posting is concerned.
6. Let the decision be taken within one week from the submission of the representation and communicated to the petitioner.
7. We have made it clear that we have not expressed any opinion as to the place of posting to which the petitioner would be entitled. We only clarify that the posting has to be at any of the three places, i.e., Guwahati, Hyderabad or Jammu.
8. The petition is disposed of. Pending application stands disposed of.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

SEPTEMBER 25, 2025/pa