



\$~95

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4559/2026, CM APPL. 22227-22229/2026**

SHRI VINOD KUMAR MALIK

.....Petitioner

Through: In person.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

07.04.2026

%

1. This writ petition seeks the following reliefs:

"A. Issue a writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction quashing and setting aside the Memorandum/ Chargesheet dated 27.09.2024, together with all pending and consequential disciplinary proceedings, in view of the inordinate, unexplained, and prejudicial delay wholly attributable to the Respondents.

B. Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing the Respondents to grant the Petitioner all consequential service and pensionary benefits flowing from the quashing of the Memorandum/ Charge sheet dated 27.09.2024 and the disciplinary proceedings initiated pursuant thereto, in accordance with law.

C. Issue the direction to the chief secretary of Delhi to order a departmental Inquiry to establish the accountability in delay to conclude the inquiry against the petitioner and conclude it within stipulated time period.

D. Issue the direction to the secretary of Education DOE Delhi to issue new anti-dated vigilance clearance report without extraneous insertions and subsequently regular pension order restoring all due benefits and submit a compliance report to the Hon'ble High court within 15 days.

E. Pass an orders in favour of the Petitioner and against the Respondent allcost of and relating to the present petition;"

2. At the outset, this Court has considered the maintainability of the



present petition. The dispute raised herein arises out of disciplinary proceedings initiated under the CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965 and pertains to service matters falling within the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal¹ under Section 14 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. Moreover, in view of the judgment of the Supreme Court in *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India & Ors.*,² the Petitioner, has an efficacious alternative remedy before the Tribunal, and therefore, cannot invoke the writ jurisdiction of this Court.

3. Considering the above, this Court is not inclined to entertain the present petition in view of the availability of an alternate efficacious remedy before CAT.

4. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed with liberty to the Petitioner to take recourse to appropriate remedies in accordance with law before CAT. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

APRIL 7, 2026

nk

¹ “

² (1997) 3 SCC 261.