



\$~77

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 17022/2025, CM APPL. 70014/2025 & CM APPL. 70015/2025

RAJESH KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Satwik Misra, Ms. Gunjan Dogra
& Ms. Devashree, Advocates.

versus

AIRPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anshul Rai & Ms. Mallika
Ranjan, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

ORDER

11.11.2025

%

1. This petition is filed seeking quashing of order dated 02.07.2024 whereby the representation of the petitioner for refixation of the seniority has been rejected.
2. The brief facts are that the petitioner joined Airport Authority of India (AAI) on 22.11.1996 as Superintendent (ATC).
3. As per the seniority list issued on 25.02.2004, the petitioner was placed at serial no. 16. On 01.02.2005 the draft seniority list was issued, the petitioner was at serial no. 25.
4. Departmental proceedings were initiated against the petitioner in May 2005 and these culminated in punishment of censure. During the pendency of the departmental proceedings, the result of the petitioner for promotion was kept in a sealed cover by the DPC.
5. The petitioner after culmination of the departmental proceedings



made a representation for refixation of the seniority in view of the fact that only a punishment of censure was given to the petitioner. The representation was rejected vide communication dated 02.07.2024.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the representation for refixation of seniority has been rejected without application of mind.

7. Learned counsel for the respondent appearing on advance notice defends the impugned order.

8. From perusal, the impugned communication is bald of reasons. The communication is only to the effect that representation has not found favour with the competent authority.

9. The law is well settled that principles of natural justice are to be applied even in administrative decisions affecting the civil right.

10. The request for refixation of seniority of the petitioner which was kept in a sealed cover due to the pendency of departmental proceedings was required to be revisited but no reason whatsoever is mentioned for not doing so.

11. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, the impugned communication is set aside, directing the respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner afresh, in accordance with law and dispose it by passing a speaking order.

12. Needless to say that the petitioner if aggrieved of the decision shall be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law.

13. An expeditious action by the respondent shall be appreciated.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J

NOVEMBER 11, 2025/‘JK’