



\$~54

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

+ **W.P.(C) 18857/2025 & CM APPL. 78481/2025**

RITU RANJAN KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Ms. Garima &
Mr. Harish, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Richa Kapoor, Mr. Kunal Anand
& Ms. Udipti Chopra, Adv. for FCI.
Ms. Ekta Choudhary, Adv. for R3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

ORDER

% **12.12.2025**

1. Learned counsel for the respondents appear on advance notice and raise a preliminary objection that the termination order is appealable and so is specifically mentioned in the impugned order.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that one of the petitioners had already approached the Appellate Authority and the appeal has been dismissed. He further states that the remedy of appeal does not lie. The contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner is against a statutory provision that is the provision for appeal as provided under Section 68(2) read with 54 of Food Corporation of India (Staff) Regulations, 1971.
3. No exceptional case is made out for interference by the writ jurisdiction in case of availability of the statutory remedy.
4. This petition is dismissed relegating the petitioner to the remedy of appeal.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J

DECEMBER 12, 2025/Ch