



\$~112

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

% **Date of Decision: 13th July, 2026**

+ CONT.CAS(C) 1170/2026

MANOJ KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. G.S. Chauhan, Advocate (M:
9811346171)

versus

GOVIND MOHAN & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Bhagwan Swarup Shukla, CGSC
with Ms. Shreya Mishra, Mr. Praveen
Gupta, Advocates for UOI

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

MINI PUSHKARNA, J. (ORAL):

1. The present petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the judgment dated 03rd October, 2023, passed in *W.P.(C) 11488/2018*, titled as *Kailash Chand Saini and Ors. Versus Union of India & Anr.*
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the respondents have now passed an order dated 26th May, 2025, however, the same is a complete eyewash, and has been passed in a cursory manner without addressing the grievances of the petitioner, in terms of the judgment dated 03rd October, 2023.
3. It is further submitted that the respondents have not considered any of the principles pertaining to the cadre review exercise of Indo-Tibetan Border Police ("ITBP"), as laid down by this Court in the case of *Ajay Suryavanshi and Ors. Versus Union of India and Ors.* in *W.P.(C) 1611/2015* and *3046/2015*, decided on 22nd April, 2015.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that all the operational and functional requirements of the pioneer cadre were explained in detail, along with comparative charts reflecting the percentage of the number of higher posts in other Non-General Duty (“GD”) cadres of the ITBF, and the discrimination against the said pioneer cadre. However, the respondents have not considered the materials that were provided in the writ petition and during the personal hearing. Thus, the order dated 26th May, 2025 is a non-speaking order.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court notes that pursuant to the judgment dated 03rd October, 2023, the order dated 26th May, 2025 already stands passed by the Directorate General, ITBF, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.

6. Merely because there is some alleged discrepancy as per the petitioner in the order passed by the respondent, the same cannot be a ground for initiating contempt proceedings.

7. In case, the petitioner is aggrieved by the said order dated 26th May, 2025, passed by the respondents, the petitioner is at liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law.

8. With the aforesaid directions, the present petition, is accordingly disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

JULY 13, 2026/au