



2026:DHC:4373-DB



\$~69

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9221/2022**

PAWAN KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Gaurav Sarawat, Mr. U. Srivastava, & Mr. M.K. Gaur,**
Advocates.

Versus

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY, GOVT.
OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: **Mrs Avnish Ahlawat SC
GNCTD Services, Mr Nitesh
Kumar Singh, Ms Aliza Alam
& Mr Mohnish Sehrawat,**
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

JUDGMENT(ORAL)

%

14.05.2026

C.HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. This writ petition is directed against order dated 14 August 2018 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal¹ in OA 1059/2013 and order dated 2 March 2020 passed by the Tribunal in RA 44/2019.

2. By the first order dated 14 August 2018, the OA filed by the petitioner was dismissed and, by the second order dated 2 March



2026:DHC:4373-DB



2020, the RA filed by the petitioner seeking review of the order passed in the OA was also dismissed.

3. One of the grievances of the petitioner, which is the only grievance which has been considered by this court and which Mr. Shrivastava also presses, is that there is nothing to indicate that the revision application of petitioner was considered by the Chief Secretary.

4. The order dismissing the revision application purports to be a communication of the decision of the Chief Secretary. However, Mr. Shrivastava's contention is that, if there was any such order of the Chief Secretary, the order itself ought to have been communicated to his client.

5. For this reason, this Court has repeatedly been directing the respondent, from 23 November 2022 onwards, to produce the records so that the Court could ascertain whether there was, in fact, any order by the Chief Secretary dealing with the petitioner's revision application.

6. Mr. N. K. Singh, learned Counsel for the respondent, on instructions, candidly acknowledges that no such record is available.

7. In that view of the matter, the Court has no option but to draw an adverse inference.



2026:DHC:4373-DB



8. Accordingly, the impugned orders passed by the Tribunal are quashed and set aside to the extent they uphold the decision taken on the revision application filed by the petitioner.

9. The revision application filed by the petitioner is remanded for fresh consideration by the Chief Secretary as the competent authority to consider the application.

10. We request the Chief Secretary to consider the application expeditiously, as the matter is almost of ten years' vintage.

11. The decision, as and when taken, would be communicated forthwith to the petitioner as well as to his counsel. Needless to say, should the petitioner continue to remain aggrieved, his remedies in law would remain reserved.

12. The writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.

MAY 14, 2026/jk