



\$~65

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1488/2026**

AMIT KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sumit Kumar Dwivedi, Mr.
Kishan Dutt and Mr. Raghav Gupta,
Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukul Singh CGSC, Mr. Adhiraj
Singh GP, Mr. Aryan Dhaka Adv
Mr. Ajay Pal, Law Officer, Insp.
Athurv and Mr. Ramniwas Yadav-
CRPF

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

03.02.2026

CM APPL. 7164/2026 (Exemption)

1. Exemption is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 1488/2026

3. This petition has been filed with the following prayers:-

“5.1. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of CERTIORARI calling for the records of the case and quashing the Impugned Order dated 23.10.2025 passed by Respondent No.4;

5.2. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of CERTIORARI quashing the Rejection Order dated 03.12.2025



passed by Respondent No.4;

5.3. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of MANDAMUS commanding the Respondents to forthwith reinstate the Petitioner into service with continuity of service, seniority, and full back wages for the intervening period;

5.4. Issue a direction to the Respondents to produce the Original Service Record and the Original VRS Application of the Petitioner before this Hon'ble Court for forensic inspection, as the Petitioner apprehends tampering; and

5.5. Pass any other suitable writ, order or direction as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

4. We have heard learned counsel for the parties. We note the challenge is primarily to the order passed by the respondents, accepting the request of Voluntary Retirement of the petitioner.

5. Though, the counsel state that the Voluntary Retirement was submitted by him under coercion, the petitioner shall be satisfied if the representation made by the petitioner to the Inspector General ('IG') of CRPF who is the Appellate Authority is decided.

6. Mr. Mukul Singh, learned counsel for the respondents who appears on advance notice states that the IG who is stationed at Dehradun shall decide the representation dated 18.11.2025 made by the petitioner, within four weeks.

7. It goes without saying, if any order is passed to the prejudice of the petitioner, he shall be within his right to seek such remedy as available in law.

8. We may clarify that, though an objection on the maintainability of the petition in this court has been raised by the Court, the order passed must not be construed that this Court has entertained the petition *de hors* the objection



raised on maintainability.

9. In view of the above, the petition is disposed of.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

FEBRUARY 3, 2026

rk