



\$~114

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4485/2026, CM APPL. 21851/2026 & CM APPL. 21852/2026**

ONKAR SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

UNION OF INDIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Tiwari, CGSC with Mr. Varun Pratap Singh, GP, Ms. Ayushi Srivastava, Mr. Ayush Tanwar, Mr. Arpan Narwal and Mr. Kushagra Malik, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

06.04.2026

1. The petition is for the following reliefs:

- 1. Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ/direction directing the Respondent to formulate and implement a Scheme mandating all Union Ministers to interact with and hear grievances from the public for at least two hours daily via video conferencing;*
- 2. Kindly convert this petition into a PIL*
- 3. Pass any other order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.*

2. The petitioner claims to be retired Senior Manager from a Nationalized Bank. It is the case of the petitioner that he has faced several instances of alleged mistreatments by various government departments. He submits that he has made several attempts to meet the government officials/ministers to seek redressal of his grievance and to bring to light



negligent/inappropriate activities of various executive officers.

3. The petitioner herein, is seeking formulation of a scheme/policy to facilitate access to Union Ministers, whereby the grievances of the civil citizens shall be addressed for at least two hours daily via video conferencing.

4. The sole grievance of the petitioner pertains to formulation of a scheme or policy requiring Union Ministers to mandatorily interact with citizens for a specified duration on a daily basis. It is a settled position of law that the power to frame policies, devise administrative mechanisms and determine the manner of discharge of executive functions lies squarely within the domain of the executive. The constitutional Courts, while exercising powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, do not ordinarily interfere in such policy matters unless there exists a clear violation of any statutory provision, constitutional mandate, or demonstrable arbitrariness.

5. The Supreme Court in ***Common Cause v. Union of India***¹ has reiterated the principle of judicial restraint, holding that where legislative discretion has been consciously delegated to the executive, the Courts must refrain from encroaching upon such domain. The said decision underscores the delicate constitutional balance between the three organs of the State and cautions against judicial overreach in matters involving policy formulation and administrative structuring. The judiciary cannot direct the executive to frame a particular policy or prescribe the manner in which such policy ought to be implemented, in the absence of any enforceable legal right.

6. Applying the aforesaid principles to the facts of the present case, this



Court finds that the relief sought by the petitioner essentially requires issuance of a *mandamus* to direct the executive to formulate and implement a specific scheme governing the functioning of Union Ministers. Such a direction would amount to transgressing into the exclusive domain of the executive and would be contrary to the doctrine of separation of powers.

7. In view of the aforementioned, there does not seem to be any justification to direct the respondent to formulate and implement a scheme mandating all Union Ministers to interact and hear the grievances from the public at least for two hours daily through video conferencing.

8. Even otherwise, these aspects will have to be dealt with by the concerned Ministry or the public representative. There cannot be any *mandamus* to that extent.

9. In view of aforesaid, the instant petition is bereft of merit and the same is, accordingly, dismissed. Pending applications also stand dismissed.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 6, 2026/Sh/ss

¹ 2003 SCC OnLine 1114