



\$~53

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

+ W.P.(C) 4017/2026

EX CT. (COOK) SUSHIL KHARWARPetitioner

Through: Mr. Ravi Kumar, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Farman Ali CGSC with
Ms. Usha Jamnal, Adv. for
UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **29.04.2026**

1. By way of the present Writ Petition, the Petitioner assails Orders dated 31.07.2024 and 17.02.2025 issued by the Respondents and seeks direction for reinstatement into service with all consequential benefits. By way of Order dated 31.07.2024 [hereinafter referred to as 'IO-1'], the service of the Petitioner, who was serving as a Constable (Cook) in the Border Security Force (BSF), came to be terminated. Aggrieved thereby, the Petitioner submitted a representation challenging the validity of IO-1, however, the same also came to be rejected by way of Order dated 17.02.2025 [hereinafter referred to as 'IO-2'].

2. Pithily put, in the year 2024, the Petitioner was enrolled as a Constable (Cook) with the BSF. As per the terms and conditions laid down in the appointment letter, the said appointment was merely provisional in nature, subject to confirmation after due verification of documents produced by the Petitioner at the time of enrolment.

3. It has been claimed by the Petitioner that he had undergone skill



training in food production from the Electronics Sector Skills Council of India (ESSCI), Varanasi under the aegis of National Skill Development Corporation (NSDC). However, upon verification, it transpired that the aforesaid institute does not provide skill training in food production, and the trade certificate relied upon by the Petitioner was never issued by the said institute.

4. Upon discovery of the aforestated discrepancy, the Competent Authority issued a Show Cause Notice to the Petitioner, calling upon him to explain as to why he should not be terminated from Service. In response, the Petitioner stated that he assumed that such conditions have been relaxed. Having found the explanation rendered by the Petitioner, non-satisfactory, the appointment of the Petitioner came to be cancelled by way of the IO-1.

5. Pursuant thereto, the Petitioner filed a representation challenging the IO-1, however, upon giving due consideration to the facts and circumstances, the same came to be rejected by the Competent Authority by way of IO-2. Aggrieved by such dismissal, the Petitioner has approached this Court seeking our indulgence.

6. We have heard learned counsel representing the parties and perused the record.

7. At the outset, we highlight that the Petitioner had already been afforded adequate and sufficient opportunity to substantiate his claim, however, upon his failure to do so, his services came to be terminated. Moreover, the Petitioner has failed to establish that he had, in fact, undergone skill training in food production from the ESSCI.

8. It is also important to highlight that the termination of the Petitioner's service is in accordance with the terms and conditions laid down in the appointment letter, in as much as the trade certificated



provided by the Petitioner was found to be fake, therefore, his provisional enrollment was liable to be cancelled.

9. In the absence of any cogent and/or credible material in support of the claim of the Petitioner, no ground for interference is made out.

10. Hence, this Court finds no infirmity in the Orders passed by the Respondents.

11. Accordingly, the present petition, being devoid of merit, stands dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

APRIL 29, 2026/sp/hr