



\$~21

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

+ W.P.(C) 16282/2024
PUSHRAJ

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Samrendra Kumar, Mr. Vivek
Kumar Srivastava and Mr. Ravi
Bhushan Upadhyay, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manisha Agrawal Narain,
CGSC with Mr. Nipun, Advocate
for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

12.08.2025

1. Both the writ petition and the counter affidavit are bereft of requisite details. The petitioner alleges wrongful termination of his employment, but not even the date of termination has been stated in the writ petition. Similarly, the counter affidavit refers to annexures which have not been filed. Further, paragraphs 4, 5, and 6 of the counter affidavit, which read as follows, are unsupported by documents:

“4. The Petitioner was initially engaged on 26.12.2014 for a period of 5 years and thereafter his tenure was extended for 1 year 4 months 9 days and subsequently another extension was given for 3 years. Thereafter there was no extension given, leading expiration of the engagement of the Petitioner.

5. It is submitted that the primary criteria for the extension of the tenure of engagement are based on the project requirement and the performance of the individual. The Petitioner has to maintain minimum



of > 80 marks consistently in ePMS rating in order to get the extension of the engagement. He did not maintain the said criteria and hence his tenure was not extended.

6. The Respondent, though not under the obligation, duly informed the Petitioner via email dated 26.03.2024 that the engagement of the Petitioner will not be extended further as per the agreed term of the engagement.”

2. Both sides are granted a period of two weeks from today to file additional documents in support of their pleadings. The documents be filed with a supporting affidavit.
3. List on 09.09.2025, in the category of “*Old/Targeted cases*”.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

AUGUST 12, 2025
UK/KA/