



\$~72

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4140/2026 & CM APPLs. 20232-20233/2026**

DR VIKAS SHIVAJIRAO MAHALKAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankur Khandelwal, Mr. Chirag Sharma, Mr. Nikhil Saurabh and Ms. Phallya Jain, Advocates.

versus

OIL AND NATURAL GAS CORPORATION LIMITED & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhishek Puri, Mr. Sahil Grewal and Ms. Surbhi Gupta, Advocates for R-1.

Mr. T. Singhdev, Mr. Abhijit Chakravarty, Mr. Tanishq Srivastav, Ms. Yamini Singh, Mr. Vedant Sood and Ms. Ramanpreet Kaur, Advocates for R-3.

Mr. Sriharsha Peechara, SC for NBEMS.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

30.03.2026

1. At the request of counsel for the Petitioner, National Board of Examination Medical Science is impleaded as Respondent No. 5. Amended memo of parties be filed within a period of one week from today.
2. The Petitioner is a medical officer employed with Respondent No. 1 since 23rd November, 2015. It is asserted that he has rendered continuous service with a meritorious record and consistently favourable Performance Appraisal Reports. The Petitioner participated in the NEET-PG counselling



process conducted by the Medical Counselling Committee and, in the Stray Vacancy Round, was allotted a DNB quota seat in the two-year Diploma in Family Medicine at General (Civil) Hospital, Sector-6, Panchkula, Haryana. The course is stated to have commenced on 1st March, 2026, and the Petitioner has completed the requisite admission formalities.

3. Upon such allotment, the Petitioner applied for grant of Extraordinary Leave (EOL) under the ONGC Leave Rules, 1995. The application was duly recommended by the competent Controlling Officers, including the GM In-charge (Medical) and the ED-Basin Manager (L-1), WON Basin. It is the Petitioner's case that despite these recommendations, the competent authority rejected the Petitioner's request for grant of EOL by way of the impugned communication issued by the Chief Manager (HR).

4. At this stage, counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner would be satisfied if Respondent No. 1 is directed to reconsider the Petitioner's case. It is further submitted that the present writ petition itself may be treated as a representation for such reconsideration. Counsel additionally submits that, having regard to the requirement of joining the course, the Petitioner has already completed admission formalities and, therefore, protection be granted against any adverse or coercive action by Respondent No. 1 during the pendency of such reconsideration.

5. Having regard to the limited nature of the relief sought, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to Respondent No. 1 to treat the present writ petition as a representation of the Petitioner and to take a fresh, reasoned decision in accordance with applicable rules and policy. Such decision shall be communicated to the Petitioner within a period of seven days from today.



6. Till such time, Respondent No. 1 shall not take any coercive or adverse action against the Petitioner. In the event the decision taken is adverse to the Petitioner, it shall be open to him to avail of appropriate remedies in accordance with law.

7. With the above directions, the present petition is disposed of along with pending applications.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MARCH 30, 2026

as