



\$~61

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

Date of decision: 11.12.2025

+ W.P.(C) 18796/2025 & CM APPL. 78242/2025
COMMISSIONER OF POLICE AND ORSPetitioners
Through: Mr.Sushil Kumar Pandey, SPC,
Ms.Shivani Supriya, Adv.

versus

MANGTURespondent
Through: In person.

CORAM:

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN**

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 16.04.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 579/2024, titled *Mangtu v. Commissioner of Police and Others*, allowing the said O.A. filed by the respondent herein, with the following directions:

*"34. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances in the present case, we are of the considered view that the instant OA deserves to be partly allowed and the same is partly allowed with the following directions: -
(i) The impugned order dated 22.07.2023 (Annexure-A/1) passed by the Disciplinary Authority and the order dated 18.03.2024 (Annexure-A/IA) passed by the Appellate*



Authority are quashed and set aside. In so far as order dated 12.10.2023 (Annexure-A/2) is concerned, interim relief was granted to the applicant i.e. HC Mangtu by this Tribunal vide order dated 19.02.2024. Interim order granted by this Tribunal vide order dated 19.02.2024 is made absolute.

- (ii) The applicant shall be entitled to all consequential benefits in accordance with the relevant rules and instructions on the subject;
- (iii) The respondents shall implement the aforesaid directions within eight weeks of receipt of a copy of this order; and
- (iv) However, the respondents shall be at liberty to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the applicant in accordance with the law.
- (v) In view of the judgment dated 14.08.2024 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in WP (C) 11276/2014 in the matter of **The Commissioner of Police & Ors. Vs. Om Prakash and Anr.**, we do not find any improvement in the manner of working of the respondents and come to the conclusion that this Tribunal cannot remain a mute spectator to such inactions of the respondents. We are of the firm view that inaction on the part of respondents deserves to be dealt with seriously and accordingly, a cost of Rs,50,000/- (Rs. Fifty Thousand) each is imposed upon the respondents nos. 2 & 3. The cost shall be paid in the Prime Minister's Relief Funds within above mentioned period of eight weeks. The respondent no. 1 is further directed to record inaction on the part of the Respondents nos. 2 & 3 in their APAR for the year 2025-26.
- (vi) Pending MAs, if any, stand closed.
- (vii) A copy of this common order be placed on record of both the captioned O.As.”

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners confines the prayer in the writ petition only to a limited challenge to the direction passed by



the learned Tribunal as contained in Paragraph 34(v) of the Impugned Order.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the remaining directions of the learned Tribunal have been complied with, which is confirmed by the respondent, who appears in person on advance notice of this petition.

4. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners and finding that no *mala fides* can be attributed to petitioner nos. 2 and 3, we allow the limited prayer of the petitioners and set aside the direction contained in Paragraph 34(v) of the Impugned Order dated 16.04.2025 passed by the learned Tribunal in the above-mentioned O.A.

5. The present writ petition, along with the pending application, is disposed of in the above terms.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

DECEMBER 11, 2025/Arya/as