



\$~S-1

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

+ W.P.(C) 12604/2022

RANI SINGH

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. R.V. Sinha and Mr. A.S.
Singh, Advs.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT
OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ripudaman Bhardwaj,
CGSC with Mr. Kushagra Kumar and Mr.
Amit Kumar Rana, Adv. for UOI

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL

ORDER

%

24.04.2026

REVIEW PET. 544/2025

1. During the course of hearing of the review petition, Mr. Sinha, learned counsel for the petitioner points out that, in para 28.5 of the judgment of which review is sought, we have held that the Disciplinary Authority was justified in invoking Explanation (b) to Rule 17(2) of the Delhi Police (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 1980¹ by adopting a view that the husband of the petitioner could not be found without undue delay.

2. Mr. Sinha exhorts the Court to reconsider this aspect keeping in mind the fact that the husband of the petitioner was missing only for six

¹ DPPAR



months by the time the order of dismissal was passed. He submits that no efforts had been taken by the respondents to trace the husband of the petitioner and therefore, the Disciplinary Authority, could not have taken a view that he could not be found without inordinate delay.

3. In the interests of justice and keeping in mind the fact that in the ultimate eventuate what lies in the balance is the entitlement of a widow to family pension, this Court is inclined to hear learned counsel for the parties on the aspect of whether Explanation (b) to Rule 17(2) of DPPAR was correctly invoked.

4. For that matter, we relist the writ petition for hearing solely on this aspect.

5. Both sides are directed to place on record short notes of their respective written submissions on this aspect, not exceeding four pages each, at least a week in advance of the next date of hearing.

6. Renotify on 10 July 2026.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

AJAY DIGPAUL J.

APRIL 24, 2026/yg