



\$~47

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9642/2025 CM APPL. 6750/2026**

BRAHM PRAKASH YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Mohd. Faisal, Adv.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

....Respondents

Through: Ms. Shagun Shahi Chugh, Mr. Varun Chugh, Ms. Kavya Roy Choudhury, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **02.02.2026**

1. This petition has been filed with the following prayers:

“Given the facts and circumstances stated above, it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to:

a) issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction to the Respondents to decide the case of the Petitioner in a time bound manner and in the meantime direct the Respondents to immediately (i) issue a Pension Payment Order (PPO) number/provisional PPO to the Petitioner (ii) issue CGHS card and other related medical facilities to the Petitioner and his family (iii) to reconsider the recommendation for the President's Police Medal for Gallantry (PPMG) for the Petitioner's exemplary service and act of valor during the operation on 29.09.2019 in Batote, District Ramban, Jammu & Kashmir (iv) to release all due payments (Gratuity, Risk Fund Premia, Leave Encashment) immediately (v) to issue an identity card/provisional card as a veteran and provide canteen facilities to Petitioner....”



2. The prayer made is primarily that the respondents shall decide the case of the petitioner in a time bound manner. In the meantime, they should immediately issue a PPO, and other relatable benefits, which otherwise the petitioner is entitled to.
3. We have been informed two charge sheets were issued to the petitioner. One chargesheet has culminated in an order of penalty.
4. The aforesaid would reveal that one charge sheet is still pending consideration.
5. We have been informed that the Union Public Service Commission (hereinafter, 'UPSC') advise has been sought by the respondents, wherein certain objections have been raised by the UPSC.
6. The objections need to be cleared before a communication is sent to the UPSC.
7. The only issue which remains for consideration is whether dehors the pendency of one charge sheet, further action in respect of the benefits, which are to be granted to the petitioner, can be finalised.
8. The answer has to be 'No'. Though the learned counsel for the respondents states that eight months' time be granted to finalise the second charge sheet, we are of the view that, as the chargesheet was issued in the year 2022 and four years have gone by, the respondents shall pass a final order within period of six months from today.
9. The petition is accordingly disposed of.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

FEBRUARY 02, 2026/tg