



\$~8

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1652/2026 and CM APPL. 8031/2026**

ANUJ

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mukesh M Goel and Mr. SP
Dubey Advocates.

versus

**DELHI URBAN SHELTER IMPROVEMENT
BOARD**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Anuj Chaturvedi, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

07.02.2026

CM APPL. 8032/2026 (EXEMPTION)

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 1652/2026

1. Heard Mr. Mukesh M. Goyal, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner. He raises various grievances against the impugned show cause notice and he tries to emphasise that the same has been issued with pre-determined mind. He also points out from *Annexure P-5* that pursuant to the earlier show cause notice dated 29.08.2024, the petitioner *vide* his communication dated 12.11.2024 requested for certain documents, however, those documents have not been furnished.
2. Mr. Anuj Chaturvedi, learned counsel appearing for the respondents,



on advance instructions, submits that no final action is taken against the petitioner and the petition is premature. He, however, submits that in any case, the respondents are ready to furnish any of the documents desired by the petitioner, if not already furnished. He submits that the respondents are considering the matter in accordance with the extant rules and regulations and without any pre-determined view.

3. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel appearing for the parties, the Court finds that the show cause notice dated 12.01.2026 is under challenge. The final decision has not yet been taken. The concluding part of the show cause notice is extracted as under:

“NOW, THEREFORE, Shri Anuj, Jr. Engineer(Intern) now JE C-3, is hereby given a final opportunity to explain his conduct in the entire episode and submit explanation into all the above incidents and findings and also as to why his engagement as contractual Junior Engineer in DUSIB may not terminated for the above lapses. His reply, if any, in writing, should reach the undersigned within a period of 10 days of issue of this Show Cause Notice. If no reply is received within the stipulated period of 10 days thereafter it shall be presumed that he has nothing to say in this regard and further action will be taken as deemed fit.”

4. It is thus seen that the same cannot be construed to be the final opinion of the Department. The Department, while issuing the show cause notice has to necessarily state certain reasons which are required to be explained by the petitioner. In the absence of there being any allegation of the cause, the petitioner may not have an opportunity to put forth his case.

5. The show cause notice, therefore, will have to be construed in that spirit. The same should not be treated to be final determination of any of the factors stated therein. Even the same is the submissions made by Mr. Chaturvedi.

6. In view thereof, there is no justification to interdict the said show



cause notice. So far as the submissions made by Mr. Goyal that some of the documents have not been furnished, it is directed that the petitioner to make a fresh request within a period of five days from today.

7. On receipt of the request made by the petitioner, let all document(s) be supplied to the petitioner within seven days therefrom. After the supply of the document(s), let the petitioner be granted 10 days further time to file a comprehensive reply.

8. After the filing of the reply, the respondents are directed to extend an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner.

9. Thereafter, the respondents shall be free to take an appropriate decision in accordance with the extant rules and regulations following due process of law.

10. Reserving all rights and contentions with the aforesaid observations, the petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 7, 2026/P/AMG