



\$~91

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 3233/2025 & CM APPLs. 15255/2025 and 15256/2025
PANKAJ KUMAR YADAVPetitioner
Through: Mr. Ajay Bansal, Mr. Gaurav
Yadava, Ms. M. Veena Bansal and Mr.
Sourav Jindal, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORSRespondents
Through: None

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.HARI SHANKAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL

% **ORDER**
12.03.2025

1. This matter was listed before the Court as the regular Bench dealing with armed forces matters is not sitting today.
2. We have heard Mr. Ajay Bansal, learned Counsel for the petitioner.
3. The writ petition assails the order dated 11 March 2025 issued by the Senior Commandant/ADM, CISF Unit, ASG Bangalore. By the said order, the petitioner has been terminated from service.
4. The termination is on the ground that the verification at the address provided by the petitioner in Tinsukia, Assam, could not found the presence of the petitioner or any of his family members at



the said address. The petitioner was, therefore, issued a show cause notice on 18 February 2025 alleging that he had wrongly stated that he was a domicile of Assam.

5. Mr. Bansal submits that the petitioner, by his reply to the show cause notice, requested that his permanent address be re-verified.

6. It appears that, the request of the petitioner was rejected and the impugned termination order was passed.

7. Mr. Bansal submits that the petitioner is a person of impecunious means and that no one was present at the residence because his father had expired and his mother had shifted out and was staying with his sister. It was for this reason, he submits, that the petitioner prayed for a re-verification.

8. We have queried of Mr. Bansal as to how this writ petition has been preferred in Delhi, when the impugned order has been passed by the office of the DIG/CASO, CISF ASG, Bangalore and the petitioner was posted at Bangalore and claims to be a domicile of Assam.

9. Article 226 entitles a writ petition to be preferred either where the respondent is residing or situated or where whole or any part of the cause of action arises.

10. We have our doubts as to whether this writ petition would lie before this Court. Nonetheless, as the petitioner is a personnel of armed forces and is stated to be of not very sound means, we restrain



the respondent from taking any action on the basis of the impugned termination order till 11 March 2025.

11. It is made clear that continuance of this order, or even issuance of notice in the writ petition, would be subject to the petitioner satisfying us on the aspect of territorial jurisdiction on 17 March 2025.

12. Re-notify on 17 March 2025.

13. Let a copy of this order be given *dasti* to learned Counsel for the petitioner under the signature of the Court Master.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

AJAY DIGPAUL, J.

MARCH 12, 2025

dsn

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)