



\$~17

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 15178/2023 & CM APPL. 60678/2023**
MAHANAGAR TELEPHONE NIGAM LTD. AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Chandan Kumar and
Mr. Vikram Sharma, Advs.

versus

SHRI YADVENDRA SHARMARespondent

Through: Respondent-in-person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

%

24.09.2025

1. From a perusal of the Impugned Order, we find that the learned Tribunal has *inter alia* observed that there was a difference of opinion between the Reporting Officer, the Reviewing Officer, and the Accepting Officer on the issue of upgradation of the ACR of the respondent for the year 2009-2010.
2. The learned counsel for the petitioners shall bring the ACR file of the respondent on the next date of hearing.
3. We further find that the benchmark for promotion had later been upgraded to 'Very Good'. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there are certain executive instructions governing how the effect of such upgradation on the past ACRs is to be considered. The learned counsel for the petitioners shall place the said executive instructions on record after supplying a copy of the same to the



respondent.

4. The respondent, who appears in person, also points out that in reply to the queries raised by him under the Right to Information Act, 2005, the petitioners admitted that there is no record of any work being assigned to the respondent during the relevant period, that is, 2009-2010.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners shall seek instructions on the same and file an affidavit, disclosing what work was assigned to the respondent during the relevant period on the basis of which his ACR was written. The affidavit in terms of the above directions be filed within a period of four weeks from today.

6. List on 15th December, 2025.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

SEPTEMBER 24, 2025/b/k/sj