

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 5247 OF 2026

Sushant Bhausaheb Sarode

....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India & Anr.

....Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5249 OF 2026**

Aniket Sunil Jadhav

....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India & Anr.

....Respondents

Mr. Venkatesh A. Shastry, for Petitioners in both matters.

Mr. Rajshekhar Govilkar (Senior Advocate) a/w. Ms. Saba N. Khan
i/b. Mr. Krishnakant Deshmukh, for Respondents.

Mr. Shehabudeen K. A. Assistant Commander (Legal), CRPF, Navi
Mumbai, present in Court, for Respondent Nos. 3 & 4.

Chinta Anna Issac, Regional Director.

Ms. Anuradha Sriram, Deputy Director.

Kavish Kuldeep, ASI Officers for SSC/Respondent No. 2.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 24th APRIL, 2026

P.C. :-

1. This is a classic case wherein, prima facie, we find that
even officers in the services of this nation have displayed the

audacity to disobey the orders of this Court. Much turns upon the discipline of such officers in respecting the Majesty of Law.

2. On 22nd April, 2026, we had passed the following order :

1. We have heard the learned Advocates for the respective parties for quite some time.
2. Shri. Shehabudeen K.A., Assistant Commander, Central Reserve Police Force ('CRPF') at Navi Mumbai, has also addressed us and drawn our attention to a communication sent by his Department to Respondent No. 2, clearly mentioning that the High Court had declared the present Petitioners qualified. A similar order passed even in the Contempt Petition and both these Petitioners were held eligible in the Detailed Medical Examination ('DME'), was also pointed out.
3. We are listing this matter on 24/04/2026 to enable the Director, Staff Selection Commission, Head Quarters New Delhi, Respondent No. 2 to remain present in the Court. ON 24/04/2026 the Director, Staff Selection Commission, Head Quarters New Delhi, Respondent No. 2 would explain why we should not initiate Contempt of Court proceedings against him for making the Petitioners approach this Court for the third time in the same case though the SLP of the Department has been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

3. It is evident from the above reproduced order that the presence of Respondent No. 2 was sought only to ensure that he could furnish better instructions to the Counsel appearing on his

behalf and to afford him an opportunity to explain why Contempt proceedings should not be initiated against him. The last paragraph of our order clearly indicates that we intended to grant him an opportunity to demonstrate that there was no willful, intentional, or deliberate disobedience of the orders of the Bombay High Court. However, what has transpired today is that the said officer has failed to remain present and has instead instructed Mr. Govilkar, the learned Senior Advocate appearing on his behalf, to present a local officer of the same rank from Mumbai, who is not even arrayed as a Respondent.

4. We are appalled by the fact that the tendency to disobey the orders of the High Court is growing to such an extent that hundreds of Contempt Petitions are being registered each year, most of them on account of disobedience by the State Government, the Central Government, or their officers.

5. Very rarely, this Court issues *suo moto* contempt notices against any officer. Our brief observations in the order dated 22nd April, 2026 clearly indicate how these two Petitioners, who aspire to join the CISF/BSF and serve the nation, are being kept at

bay despite having succeeded before this Court. A minuscule difference in height of '3 and 4 millimeters', respectively, led to the passing of the earlier order of this Court, based on precedents laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and various High Courts. Yet, the said order was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and even after the dismissal of the SLP, the disobedience has continued. These two Petitioners are still not inducted in the training program which has commenced more than 2 months ago. All other candidates are more than 2 months ahead in training and these Petitioners are still at the doorstep waiting to be inducted.

6. Mr. Govilkar, on instructions, submits that a dossier was generated on 23.04.2026. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner, in response, submits that the said dossier has been created merely to create a camouflage before the Court, suggesting that some action is being taken in the matter. It is further submitted that the dossier was generated on 23rd April, 2026, only after this Court passed an order on 22.04.2026 and summoned Respondent No. 2 to remain present. According to the Petitioner, the dossier has been prepared by Respondent no. 2, only to save his skin and to create an impression of compliance of the orders of this Court.

7. In view of the above, issue *suo moto* Contempt Notice to Respondent No. 2, Mr. R. G. Singh, Director, in the prescribed format under the Contempt of Courts Act, returnable on **29th April, 2026**. The learned Advocate, Mr. Krishnakant Deshmukh, assisting the learned Senior Advocate, Mr. Govilkar, waives service of notice.

8. List this Petition in the ‘Urgent Supplementary Board’ on **29th April, 2026**. Respondent No. 2 is at liberty to file an Affidavit-in-Reply explaining his conduct.

(HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.) (RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)