



\$~15

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7757/2026, CM APPL. 37522/2026**

SANJEEV ROHILLA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Neeraj Kumar, Ms. Meenakshi
Jha and Mr. Keshav Choudhary,
Advocates.

versus

DELHI JAL BOARD & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Nirvikar Verma, Advocate for
DJB.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

29.05.2026

%

1. This writ petition seeks the following reliefs:

- "a) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, in the nature of Certiorari, quashing and setting aside the alleged disengagement of the Petitioner vide office order no. 379 dated 27.12.2019, being illegal, arbitrary and violative of the Principles of Natural Justice;*
- b) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, in the nature of Certiorari, quashing and setting aside the impugned rejection order dated 03.02.2026, being non-speaking, arbitrary and unsustainable in law;*
- c) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, preferably in the nature of Mandamus, directing the Respondents to reinstate the Petitioner in service with continuity of service;*
- d) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, preferably in the nature of Mandamus, directing the Respondents to grant all consequential benefits to the Petitioner, including back wages, seniority and all other attendant benefits;*
- e) Declare that the alleged disengagement, not having been communicated to the Petitioner, is void, non est and unenforceable in law;*
- f) Pass any other or further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit*



and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case, in the interest of justice.”

2. At the outset, counsel for the Respondents raises a preliminary objection regarding the maintainability of the present petition. It is submitted that the Delhi Jal Board is a notified authority under Section 14(2) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and, therefore, the dispute sought to be agitated in the present petition falls within the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal. Reliance is placed on the decision of the Supreme Court in *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India & Ors.*,¹ to contend that, the Petitioner having an efficacious alternative remedy before the Tribunal, cannot directly invoke the writ jurisdiction of this Court.
3. In view of the above, counsel for the Petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the present petition with liberty to approach the Central Administrative Tribunal, in accordance with law.
4. Leave and liberty as prayed for, are granted.
5. The Court has not commented on the merits of the case. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.
6. Disposed of along with pending application.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MAY 29, 2026

nk

¹ (1997) 3 SCC 261.