



\$~99

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6596/2026 & CM APPLs. 32492-32494/2026**

RAVI SHANKER

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vibhav Mishra, Advocate.

versus

**BROADCAST ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS INDIA LTD &
ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shashank Dixit, Advocate for R-1
and R-2.

Mr. Nitinjya Chaudhry, CGSC with
Mr. Shivam Sharma, GP and Mr.
Rahul Mourya, Advocate for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

14.05.2026

1. The Petitioner impugns the order dated 14th October, 2025, passed by the Director (O&M), Broadcast Engineering Consultants India Limited [“BECIL”], whereby the major penalty of reduction to a lower stage in the time scale of pay by two stages for a period of one year has been imposed.
2. It transpires that an alternative departmental remedy by way of an appeal is available to the Petitioner, which has not yet been availed. The said appeal against the impugned order lies before the Board of Directors.
3. In view of the above, Mr. Vibhav Mishra, counsel for the Petitioner, submits that, at the first instance, the present petition may be treated as an appeal under Rule 32 of the BECIL CDA Rules and be considered by the



Board of Directors. Although the prescribed period for filing the appeal has expired, it is directed that this petition shall be treated as an appeal and shall not be rejected on the ground of limitation.

4. The Petitioner also undertakes to file a formal memorandum of appeal before the competent authority within a period of one week from the date of filing of memorandum of appeal.

5. The Board of Directors is requested to decide the appeal within a period of eight weeks from the date of filing of memorandum of appeal.

6. Needless to state, the Director (O&M), BECIL, being the disciplinary authority, shall not form part of the Board while considering the Petitioner's appeal.

7. With the aforesaid directions, the present petition, along with all pending application(s), if any, is disposed of.

8. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open. This Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

9. In the event the decision of the appellate authority is adverse to the Petitioner, he shall be at liberty to avail of such remedies as may be available to him in accordance with law.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MAY 14, 2026/hc