



\$~4

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 18430/2025 & CM APPL. 76300/2025

BANKAR HUKUM NATHA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Anil, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms Shafali Bhardwaj, SPC, Ms
Urvashi Basak, GP and Mr Sahaj
Garg, Advocate.

Mr Vinod Sawant, Law Officer,
Inspector Athurv and Mr Ramniwas
Yadav, CRPF in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

13.01.2026

1. Though, this petition is filed with the following prayers:-

“A. Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction for quashing of order dated 29.04.2025 passed by respondent no.4 (the commandant 147 bn, CRPF),, us 11 (1) of CRPF act 1949 r/w rule 27 CRPF rules 1955, imposing compulsory retirement on the ground of 'unsuitability' on the petitioner and the order dated 14.07.2025 passed by the deputy inspector general, Silchar range, CRPF, on the petition under rule 28 CRPF rules 1955;

B. Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other writ or order or direction to the Respondents to Reinstate the petitioner in service with all back wages, arrears with interest, benefits, seniority, and consequential advantages from the date of compulsory retirement i.e., 29 April 2025;

C. Pass such other or further order(s) as may be deemed just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”



We find that the revision petition (Annexure A5) has been filed by the petitioner with the Director General of Central Reserve Police Force with a copy thereof to the Inspector General, North Eastern States, CRPF.

2. The learned counsel for the respondents, states that the Revisional Authority is the Inspector General, NES, CRPF.

3. If that be so, since the copy of the revision petition dated 29.07.2025, though addressed to the Director General, has also been forwarded to the IG, NES, CRPF, appropriate shall that the IG, NES, CRPF being the Revisional Authority shall decide the revision petition (AnnexureA5) within a period of four weeks from today.

4. If goes without saying that in case the petitioner is aggrieved by the decision, he can seek such remedy, as available under the law.

5. The petition is disposed of on above terms. The pending application is also disposed of as having become infructuous.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

JANUARY 13, 2026

M