



\$~48

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

+ W.P.(C) 6028/2026

MAINPAL SINGH CHAUHAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dilip Kumar and Mr. Ashu
Sharma, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar, SPC.
Mr. Ajay Pal Law Officer,
Inspector Athurv and Mr.
Ramniwas Yadav-CRPF

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

14.05.2026

%

1. The Petitioner prays for the following reliefs:-

“(a) Call for the records of the case;

(b) Issue appropriate writ, order(s) or direction(s) in the nature of writ of mandamus, directing the respondents to:

(i) Consider the case of the petitioner for grant/release of the retiral benefits to include Compassionate Allowance (compensation pension) in terms of the provisions contemplated in Rule 41 read with Rule 39 of CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972;

(ii) Grant/release of the amount of Gratuity accrued to the petitioner during course of his service under the Gratuity Act, 1972;

(iii) For Grant/release of the leave encashment entitled to him for the leave saved by the petitioner during the course of the service.

(c) Issue appropriate writ, order(s) or direction(s) as this Hon' ble Court deem fit in the interest of justice.”

2. The services of the Petitioner were dispensed with, as he was found to have used fake Schedule Caste Certificate to secure his appointment. The Appeal filed by the Petitioner was also dismissed.



3. Learned counsel representing the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner should have been granted compassionate allowance as envisaged in Rule 41 of the CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972.

4. Admittedly, the Petitioner never prayed for such relief even before the Appellate Authority, moreover, the Petitioner possesses the remedy of challenging the correctness of the Appellate Order before the Revisionist Authority as per Rule 29 of the Central Reserve Police Force Rules, 1955.

5. Keeping in view the aforesaid position, the present Petition is disposed of with liberty to the Petitioner to avail an alternative remedy.

6. Needless to observe that this Court has not examined the correctness of the objections taken by the Respondents with regard to the territorial jurisdiction of this Court.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

MAY 14, 2026/sp/kb