



\$~91

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7125/2026**

SHIV SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Apoorv Shukla, CGSC,
Ms. Ilashri Gaur, Advocate.
Mr Vinod Sawant, Law Officer,
Insp Athurv and Mr Ramniwas
Yadav, CRPF.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **21.05.2026**

1. Through this writ petition, the Petitioner seeks issuance of writ in nature of mandamus, to direct the Respondents to decide the legal notice dated 13.01.2026, preferred by the Petitioner being aggrieved of an incorrect placement in the seniority list.
2. At the very outset, this Court notices that the present petition does not assail any specific order affecting the civil rights of the Petitioner nor does it lay challenge to the seniority list itself on cogent legal or factual grounds or sets out any specific anomaly attributable to the Respondents.
3. This Court has repeatedly observed the development of a growing trend as a matter of routine, whereby litigants while invoking the writ jurisdiction of Courts, only seek directions to the concerned authorities to consider and decide representations, without challenging



the underlying action, and without seeking substantive adjudication on merits. Such petitions effectively seek conversion of Constitutional Courts into mere forwarding agencies or post offices for administrative correspondence.

4. The Supreme Court, in ***Union of India and Ors v M.K. Sarkar***¹, while reiterating its earlier decision in ***C. Jacob v Director of Geology and Mining***², has cautioned that Courts ought not routinely issue directions for deciding representations where no enforceable legal right is established, particularly when the underlying claim may itself be stale, barred by delay and laches, or otherwise untenable in law.

5. The writ jurisdiction exercised by Courts is essentially a public law remedy intended for enforcement of legal and fundamental rights. A writ of mandamus can only be issued when the Petitioner demonstrates existence of a subsisting legal right coupled with a corresponding statutory duty cast upon the authority. Mere submission of a representation does not *ipso facto* confer a cause of action for invoking writ jurisdiction.

6. In the present case, except seeking a direction for disposal of the legal notice dated 13.01.2026, no substantive relief has been prayed for. The petition is conspicuously silent on the relevant facts forming foundational pleadings. Thus, in absence of the aforesaid, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition merely for issuance of a direction to decide the representation.

7. Accordingly, finding no ground to exercise extraordinary writ jurisdiction, the writ petition stands disposed of. However, the

¹ (2010) 2 SCC 59

² (2008) 10 SCC 115



Petitioner may, if so advised, file a writ petition seeking substantial reliefs which may be considered by the Court.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MAY 21, 2026

DV/fir