



\$~94

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 11917/2023 and CM APPL. 46595/2023
PARVEEN KUMARPetitioner

Through: Mr. Karan Chahar, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
& ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Saroj Bidawat, SPC with
Mr. Amit Acharya, GP

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

% **ORDER**
28.04.2026

1. We have heard Mr. Karan Chahar, learned counsel for the petitioner. The judgment of the Gujarat High Court in ***Union of India v. Anil Kumar***¹, to which Mr. Chahar places reliance, is, in our opinion, clearly distinguishable as, in that case, the High Court of Gujarat was persuaded to interdict the disciplinary proceedings even while they were in *seisin* essentially because it felt that the very initiation of the proceedings was contrary to the directions issued by the Supreme Court.

2. No such directions are available in the present case. However, as it appears that Mr. Chahar has prepared himself only with this decision and seeks an opportunity to cite other judgments on the basis

¹ R/Special Civil Appl. 18023/2023, decided on 5 August 2024



of which he could contend that the Tribunal should have interfered with the disciplinary proceedings midway, renotify on 29 April 2026 as part-heard.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.

APRIL 28, 2026/yg