



2025:DHC:4019-DB



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

*Reserved on: 17.02.2025*

*Pronounced on: 19.05.2025*

+ W.P.(C) 2834/2022

ANIL KUMAR SINGH AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Mr.  
Nikunj Arora, Mr. Anshuman  
Mehrotra, Ms. Muskaan Dutta  
& Mr. Amrit Koul, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Jaswinder Singh, Adv. for  
R-1 to R-3.  
Mr. Jas, Mr. Sourabh, Mr.  
Bhushan, L.O./CRPF/RAF.  
Mr. Manoj V. George, Ms.  
Shilpa Liza George, Mr. KM  
Vignesh Ram, Advs. for R-18,  
20, 22, 24, 26, 30, 34, 35, 36,  
39, 41, 42, 43, 49 & 51.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINDER KAUR**

### **J U D G M E N T**

**SHALINDER KAUR, J.**

1. The petitioners, who are Group 'B' General Duty (GD) Officers of the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF), have approached this Court by way of present writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking the following reliefs:

*"i. Issue a Writ of Certiorari for quashing the seniority list dated 01.04.2017 to the extent*



*wherein the Respondents have illegally placed the private Respondents who have joined the service after the Petitioners as Senior to them in the rank of Inspectors; and*

*ii. Issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to recast the seniority list of Inspectors of each cadre by maintaining a separate seniority list of various cadres in the rank of Inspector and thereafter, consider only those eligible executive cadre Inspectors, who fulfil the eligibility criteria for promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant (GD) as per the existing Recruitment Rules and conduct Review DPC in light of the revised Seniority List in the rank of Inspectors for promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant (GD) and those found fit to be promoted to the said rank with all consequential benefits;”*

2. The petitioners assail the correctness of Combined Seniority List issued by the respondent no. 2, on 01.04.2017, of various cadres of Inspectors in CRPF.

3. The petitioners being employees of CRPF are governed by the CRPF Act, 1949 and the CRPF Rules, 1955 (hereinafter referred to as the ‘CRPF Rules’), and in the absence of any specific Rule governing their service conditions, as per Rule 102 of the CRPF Rules, the CCS (CCA) Rules would apply to them.

4. The petitioners were enrolled in CRPF as Constables (GD) in the pay scale of Rs. 825-15-900-EB-20-1200. In 2004, they were appointed as Sub-Inspectors (SI) in the GD Cadre of CRPF after qualifying the Limited Departmental Competitive Examination (LDCE), in the pay scale of Rs. 5500-175-9000 with usual allowances as admissible to Central Government Employees from



2025:DHC:4019-DB



time to time. They subsequently, completed their basic training on 09.09.2005. Similarly, directly recruited SIs were appointed in 2004, and completed their training later, on 25.07.2006.

5. Subsequently, they were promoted to the Rank of Inspector/GD in the pay scale of PB-2 Rs.9300-34800 + Grade Pay Rs.4600/- plus usual allowances as admissible to the Central Government Employees from time to time.

6. It is the case of the petitioners that since the inception of CRPF, the Force constitutes of Group A, B, C and D employees. However, after the implementation of 6<sup>th</sup> Central Pay Commission, Group D was abolished and was merged with Group C employees. Even in Group B, the Forces has various cadres based upon different eligibility condition befitting the said cadre in relation to educational qualification, age, different physical standard norms, accordingly, the Force personnel have to undergo different training schedules and are amiable to different service conditions. On being constituted as an Armed Force of the Union, in the year 1949, a separate Seniority List of personnel appointed in different cadres has been maintained from the rank of Constable to Sub Inspector.

7. In CRPF, the GD Cadre is the main fighting arm of the Force and all other cadres help them to accomplish the task assigned to such cadre. In addition to GD Cadre, there is a Signal cadre, MT cadre, Fitter cadre, Armor cadre and the Tradesman cadre.

8. The crux of the issue is that, as per petitioners, the SIs in the Radio Operator, Technician, and other cadres, who were appointed



between December 2005 and January 2006 and completed their training in February 2007, have been placed senior to the petitioners in the Combined Seniority List issued on 01.04.2017, of various cadres, for the rank of Inspector.

9. Being aggrieved by the respondents' action of combining the Seniority List of various cadres in the rank of Inspector, the petitioners submitted a representation dated 16.07.2021 to the Director General, CRPF, requesting that the said Seniority List be corrected and further not to promote the ineligible persons to the rank of Assistant Commandant (GD). However, no response was received to their representation, and since the respondents were in process of holding Departmental Promotion Committee (DPC) for the rank of Assistant Commandant, the petitioners were compelled to file the present petition, invoking the writ jurisdiction of this Court.

### **SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF ON THE PARTIES**

10. The learned counsel for the petitioners, Mr. Ankur Chhibber, drew the attention of this Court to the hierarchy of Group B and Group C employees, pointing out that in certain other cadres, recruitment starts only from the rank of Constable/Head Constable and goes up to the rank of Inspector. The hierarchy in GD Cadre is as follows:

- “i. Constable (General Duty)*
- ii. Head Constable (General Duty)*
- iii. Assistant Sub-Inspector (General Duty)*
- iv. Sub-Inspector (General Duty)*
- v. Inspector (General Duty)*
- vi. Subdar Major (General Duty)”*



11. He submitted that separate Seniority Lists are being maintained in different cadres, from the date of their enrollment till the said officers are promoted to the rank of Inspectors.

12. The learned counsel submitted that although no provision or authority prescribes the combination of Seniority Lists for personnel holding the rank of Inspector, the respondents have unlawfully and unauthorizedly started maintaining a Combined Seniority List, merging all minor cadres with the GD Cadre. This action of the respondents has resulted in officers from minor cadres, who were appointed after GD Cadre officers, being placed senior to them, despite the petitioners being appointed to the same rank before the private respondents.

13. The learned counsel also highlighted that the CRPF Group B and C Recruitment Rules 2011, provide the rules for the appointment of Group B and C officers in the CRPF and sets various eligibility criteria for the same. He stated that a perusal of the above would clearly show that the mode of appointment, educational qualification and other essential requirements of all cadres are distinct from one another.

14. He submitted that the petitioners were appointed as SIs in the GD Cadre through the LDCE in 2004 and completed their basic training on 09.09.2005. The directly recruited SIs were appointed in the same year, but completed their training later, on 25.07.2006. Furthermore, SIs in the cadres of Radio Operator, Crypto,



Technician, etc., were appointed between December 2005 and January 2006, and completed their training in February 2007. These SIs have, however, been placed senior to the petitioners. This act of the respondents, he submitted, is in direct violation of the governing Rules and Regulations and Rule 8 of the CRPF Rules, 1955. In support of his plea, he placed reliance on the decision of the Supreme Court in *Bobindra Kumar and Anr. vs. Union of India and Ors.*, (2019) 16 SCC 652.

15. He further contended that the respondents have not considered that Rule 10.4 of the Establishment Manual of the CRPF, which clearly states that the Gradation List for Sub Inspector (GD)/Sub-Inspector (Tradesman), excluding Signals, would be maintained by the Establishment Branch of the Directorate General, while the Gradation List for the Signal Cadre will be maintained by the Communication Branch.

16. He submitted that personnel holding the rank of Inspector/GD are eligible for promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant, which is a Group 'A' post, as 33 percent of the vacancies have to be filled through promotion. However, the Central Reserve Police Force Group A (General Duty) Officers Recruitment Rules, 2001 stipulates certain eligibility criteria for such promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant, one of which is that they are required to complete two years of service in a Service Company of a Duty Battalion, as per column 12 (d) of the said Rules. He submitted that the minor cadre officers do not meet this requirement, as for other cadres their duty is



2025:DHC:4019-DB



treated as Battalion Service. Despite failing to fulfill this eligibility criterion, the respondents, in clear violation of their own Recruitment Rules, are in the process of further processing DPC for promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant, by considering Inspectors who are not fulfilling the eligibility criteria, to the rank of Assistant Commandant.

17. Mr. KM Vignesh Ram, the learned counsel for the respondent no 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 30, 34, 35, 36, 39, 41, 42, 43, 49 & 51, at the outset, challenged the petition on the ground of extraordinary delay in approaching this Court, and submitted that the writ petition is based on the petitioners' grievance against the Seniority List published on 01.04.2017. As the primary objection arose in 2017, the cause of action also dates back to that year. Thus, the petitioners' belated filing of the Writ Petition after more than five years, constitutes an abuse of process and deserves to be dismissed without delving into its merits, as the rights of the private respondents have been crystallised.

18. He further contended that since the petitioners have not challenged the Establishment Manual in the present petition, they cannot now challenge the gradation list. To this effect it was also highlighted that Rule 4 (a) of the CRPF Rules 1955, explicitly provides the competent authority with the powers to issue rules and instructions which would govern the working of the Force from time to time for all cases not specifically provided for in the Rules.



19. He further submitted that the differences in educational qualifications for the said cadres of General Duty, Signal, etc alone will not place the GD in an upper footing than its counterparts, for the reason that the plenary Act and its corresponding delegated legislation does not differentiate between the said cadres.

20. On behalf of respondent no 1-3, Mr. Jaswinder Singh, while reiterating the arguments made by Mr. KM Vignesh Ram, further submitted that a Combined Gradation List of Inspectors is maintained as per Para-10.4(I)(iv) Chapter-X (Seniority and Confirmation) of the Establishment Manual (Corrected up to 11/05/2012), by the Establishment Branch for the purpose of detailing them on the Senior Inspector Cadre Course (now ACPC), which is a prerequisite qualification for promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant (Coy Commander). Further, as per Para 11.2(4) of the aforementioned Manual, technical personnel such as MT Drivers, Fitters (now MMV), Armourers, Signal personnel, etc., will have separate cadres for promotion, confirmation etc., however, subject to the qualification requirements for promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant, the Inspectors of MT, Armourers, Signal personnels, GD personnels, and others will form part of a common pool, and a Combined Gradation List will be maintained.

21. Mr. Singh submitted that, in terms of Para 10.4(2)(i) of Chapter X of the said Manual, the Gradation List is required to be maintained in and kept up to date, and is published annually, affording an opportunity to represent within 45 days from the date of



2025:DHC:4019-DB



publication of such list. He submitted that the petitioners did not avail of this opportunity, as no challenge/representation was submitted by them.

22. Further, drawing our reference to the Standing Order 01/2021 dated 17.02.2021, he submitted that the constables of all cadres, including Ct/GD, are permitted to remuster into various cadres of the Executive Force/Posts to perform specialized duties.

23. He further submitted that Group 'A' Recruitment Rules, 2010, stipulate that the post of Assistant Commandant is to be filled by promotion from Subedar Majors (SM)/Inspectors with three years of service in the grade and successful completion of the Senior Inspector Cadre Course (now ACPC). He submitted that, as per Rule 103 of the CRPF Rules, CRPF Group 'A' Rules and provisions in the Establishment Manual, superior posts in the Force belong to all the cadres of the Executive Force/Posts (non gazetted) for their career progression, not exclusively to the GD cadre. Thus, the Recruitment Rules do not specify that the posts shall be filled exclusively by SM (GD) or Inspector (GD).

24. The learned counsel for the respondents contended that the private respondents were placed above the petitioners in the Combined Gradation List of Inspectors because they were released on promotion to the rank of Inspector before the petitioners. A person promoted to the rank of Inspector at an earlier date, cannot be made junior to a person promoted later. He placed reliance on Rule 57 of



2025:DHC:4019-DB



the CRPF Rules, 1955, and submitted that the said Rule is clear that seniority shall depend on the date of confirmation in each rank.

25. He further contended that in terms of the Paragraph 14(a) of the Standing Order No. 3 of 2012 dated 26.04.2012, which provides Seniority of Subordinate Officers and under Officers in Signal cadre, will be decided strictly according to 8(c) and (d) of the CRPF Rules, these Rules provide that officer shall take his seniority from the date of his continuously holding such rank, and on confirmation, the officer shall take his seniority from the date of such confirmation.

26. The learned counsel contended that the requirement of two years' service in a service company (Mandatory Field Service - MFS) applies only to the Executive Force/Posts of the GD cadre that exist in Service Companies of Duty Battalions. Further, in terms of Para (f) of the Instructions dated 04.07.2012, services rendered by SI/GD and Inspector/GD in certain specialized units such as AWS, CWS, SWS, PDG, Sports Teams, BDDS, Dog Squads, NSG, SPG, Training Institutions, and Intelligence Cells, are counted towards MFS, despite not being traditional Company Second-In-Command roles. Additionally, the DG, CRPF, is empowered to relax the MFS requirement in cases where an Inspector (GD) is not deployed to a location where their service qualifies for MFS.

27. In rebuttal, Mr. Chhibber submitted that the petitioners have filed a compliance affidavit pursuant to this Court's direction *vide* Order dated 15.02.2022, wherein the petitioners submitted that the Impugned Gradation List was not communicated to them and that



they became aware of the Seniority List at the time of the DPC for promotion to the post of Assistant Commandant, after which they filed a representation dated 16.07.2021, and subsequently filed the present writ petition. He submitted therefore, there is no delay in approaching this Court. To strengthen this submission, he placed reliance on the decision of the Supreme Court in ***Ajay Kumar Shukla and ors. vs Arvind Rai and Ors.***, (2022) 12 SCC 579.

28. Further, in rejoinder, he submitted that the eligibility criteria set out for promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant/General Duty cadre, does not provide any provision for relaxation in the said norm. It is not open or respondents to promote ineligible personnel without first making specific provisions in that regard. However, no such provision has been made in the present case. Furthermore, relaxation in MFS is due to administrative exigencies and its application is restricted to personnel of General Duty Cadre. These policy decisions cannot be made applicable to Non-GD Cadre. Further, he submitted, that the Private respondents were appointed as Inspector after the petitioners, and the fixation of seniority of private respondents above the petitioners, is a grave violation of Rule 8 of CRPF Rules.

### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

29. To begin with, on the question of delay in approaching the Court to challenge the seniority list, we refer to the decision in the case of ***Ajay Kumar Shukla*** (supra), where the Supreme Court dealt



with the issue of entertaining the petition challenging a long standing seniority filed at a belated stage and held as under:-

*“24. We may now discuss the law on the point regarding delay in approaching the court and in particular challenge to a seniority list. The learned Single Judge had placed reliance on a judgment of this Court in Shiba Shankar Mohapatra v. State of Orissa [Shiba Shankar Mohapatra v. State of Orissa, (2010) 12 SCC 471 : (2011) 1 SCC (L&S) 229] . Dr B.S. Chauhan, J., after considering the question of entertaining the petition despite long-standing seniority filed at a belated stage discussed more than a dozen cases on the point including Constitution Bench judgments [Ed. : The reference appears to be to Ramchandra Shankar Deodhar v. State of Maharashtra, (1974) 1 SCC 317 : 1974 SCC (L&S) 137 and Tilokchand Motichand v. H.B. Munshi, (1969) 1 SCC 110] and ultimately in para 30 observed that a seniority list which remains in existence for more than three to four years unchallenged should not be disturbed. It is also recorded in para 30 that in case someone agitates the issue of seniority beyond period of three to four years he has to explain the delay and laches in approaching the adjudicatory forum by furnishing satisfactory explanation. Para 30 is reproduced below : (SCC pp. 483-84)*

*“30. Thus in view of the above, the settled legal proposition that emerges is that once the seniority had been fixed and it remains in existence for a reasonable period, any challenge to the same should not be entertained. In K.R. Mudgal [K.R. Mudgal v. R.P. Singh, (1986) 4 SCC 531 : 1987 SCC (L&S) 6] , this Court has laid down, in crystal clear words that a seniority list which remains in existence for 3 to 4 years unchallenged, should not be disturbed. Thus, 3-4 years is a reasonable period for challenging the seniority and in case someone agitates the issue of seniority beyond this period, he has to explain the*



*delay and laches in approaching the adjudicatory forum, by furnishing satisfactory explanation.*

xxx

*39. The plea to defend the seniority list prepared contrary to the statutory provisions on the ground of delay would be a difficult proposition. Apart from the submission of the appellants that there is no delay as they came to know of the three separate lists only in March 2010, even if it is assumed that there was some delay and a fresh seniority list was being prepared in 2009-2010 again contrary to the provisions of statutory rules, such seniority list cannot be sustained or defended on the ground of delay of five years."*

30. From the above decision it is manifest that a Seniority List, which is unchallenged for 3-4 years could be assailed by explaining delay and laches in approaching the Court. In this regard, we notice that *vide* Order dated 15.02.2022, the petitioners were directed to file an affidavit clearly stating as to when the petitioners came to know about the Combined Seniority List dated 01.04.2017. The petitioners, in their affidavit, have stated that the petitioners did not have a hint or knowledge of the Seniority List until the DPC proceedings for promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant were being initiated by the respondents. However, from a perusal of the representation dated 16.07.2021 made by the petitioners, it is evident that perhaps the petitioner no.1 had filed a writ petition earlier in the year 2020. Be that as it may, since we have heard the matter on merits, we are not dwelling deep into the question of delay, as the petitioners have pleaded that they were not aware about the existence of the Seniority



List and nothing to prove the contrary has been brought to our notice by the respondents.

31. On merits, the foremost grievance of the petitioners is that in absence of any Rules, the respondents have merged the Seniority List at the rank of Inspector even though there had been separate seniority lists for the ranks below that of the Inspector. To explain the position, the learned counsel for the petitioners drew our attention to Rules regulating the method of recruitment to Grade 'A' in the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF), formulated by Ministry of Home Affairs on 12.09.2001, and contended that the mode of appointment, educational qualifications, and other essential requirements for each cadre are distinct due to the different job profiles and responsibilities of each cadre, and thus, separate Seniority Lists are being maintained in different cadres from the date of their enrollment till the said officers are promoted to the rank of SI.

32. To controvert this, the learned counsel for the respondent no. 1 to 3 has drawn our attention to the Establishment Manual of the CRPF, specifically Chapter X & XI thereof. The relevant provision, that is, Para 10.4 (I) (iv) of Chapter X (Seniority and Confirmation) of Establishment Manual (corrected up to 11.05.2012) reads as under:

*“A combined Gradation List of Inspectors GD (including Mahila)/ Technical/Signal will also be maintained by the Estt Branch of the Directorate General for the purpose of detailing them on Senior Inspector Cadre Course which is a pre-requisite qualification for promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant (Coy Commander).”*



33. Further, Para 11.2.2 (iii)(h) of Chapter XI (Promotion) of Establishment Manual (corrected upto 11.05.2012) provides as under:

*“Seniority for next promotion will be counted from dated of issue of the order of allotment by the Directorate General.”*

34. The respondent nos.1 to 3 have brought to our notice, by referring to the provisions noted hereinabove, that a Combined Gradation List of Inspectors (GD) ((Male/Female)/ Technical/Signal) is being maintained for the purpose of detailing them on Senior Inspector Cadre Course (now ACPC), which is stated to be a pre-requisite qualification for promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant (Coy Commander).

35. Furthermore, Para 11.4 provides that the personnel from technical cadres will form a common pool for promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant, subject to conditions regarding the prescribed qualifications. The said Rule reads as under:

*“4. Technical personnel: Technical personnel like MT Drivers, Fitters, Armourers, Signal personnel etc. will form separate cadre for the purpose of promotion/confirmation etc. However subject to conditions regarding qualifications prescribed for promotion to the rank of Asstt. Comdt. the Inspectors MT / Armourers / Signal personnel / GD personnel etc. will form common pool and combined Gradation List will be maintained.”*

36. Besides, according to educational qualification prescribed for SI (Crypto/RO/Technical), all of them meet the requirement of educational qualification prescribed for post of SI/GD.



37. Additionally, Para 11.9 of the Establishment Manual states that as there are no higher post for tradesman cadre, these personnel would have to compete with the personnel of GD cadres for promotion. This provision is reproduced as under:

*“11.9 Tradesmen:*

*i) The following tradesmen will come under this category:-*

*(a) Carpenters*

*(b) Cobblers*

*(c) Tailors*

*(d) Gardeners*

*(e) Bandsmen*

*(f) Buglers*

*(g) Painters*

*ii) Tradesmen (Carpenter, Cobbler, Tailors, Band) have promotional avenues in their respective Trades and they are not eligible to compete in GD line for promotion. Rather they are eligible for promotion in their respective Trades only.*

*iii) Since, there is no higher post in the Trades of Gardener, Bugler and Painter these categories have to compete in GD line for promotion for which they have to acquire requisite rank qualification of GD Cadre.”*

38. In view of the above, the submission of the respondents that the maintenance of Combined Gradation List of Inspectors GD(Male/Female)/ Technical/Signal for the purpose of detailing them on Senior Inspector Cadre Course, is in accordance with the provisions made in Establishment Manual and Instructions issued by DG, CRPF. Rule 103 of CRPF, Rules also clearly states that for Superior posts there shall be a separate cadre.



39. Admittedly, the petitioners have not challenged these instructions/provisions as contained in the Establishment Manual of CRPF. Without challenging the same, the relief sought by the petitioners, that is, direction to the respondents to recast the Seniority List of Inspectors of each cadre by maintaining a separate Seniority List of various cadres in the rank of Inspectors, cannot be granted.

40. As pointed out by respondent nos.1 to 3, the petitioners have failed to adequately address or respond to the clarification provided by the respondents regarding the Seniority List. The respondents have stated that the private respondents were placed above the petitioners in the Combined Gradation List of SM/Inspector because they were promoted to the rank of Inspector prior to the petitioners, for which he relied on Rule 57 of the CRPF Rules. The said Rule is reproduced herein below:

*“57. Determination of seniority [of Members of the Force other than the Gazetted Officers] -Seniority shall depend on the date of confirmation in each rank; provided that a person whose period of probation is extended for the reason that he is not qualified and provided further that this non-qualification is due to circumstances beyond his control, shall retain his seniority according to the date of his promotion to a rank in a clear vacancy, if he attains the necessary qualifications at the earliest available opportunity.”*

41. From a bare perusal of the above, it is evident that the seniority depends on the date of confirmation of the officers in each rank, thus, the seniority was rightly fixed in accordance with Rule 57 of the CRPF Rules.



42. The petitioners' submission, which was raised in rejoinder and introduces a new case that the non-GD cadre personnel cannot be promoted because the eligibility criteria set of promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant do not provide for any provision for relaxation in said norm, as they do not have the mandatory two years of service in a Service Company of a duty Battalion, cannot be accepted.

43. In this regard, the Circular dated 04.07.2012, in Paragraph (a) thereof states that the MHA has granted the power to the DG, CRPF to waive/relax the requirement of MFS in a duty Battalion to those personnel who could not be posted to such Units, *inter alia*, due to some technical grounds/reasons. Further, the Paragraph (f) of the said Circular is also relevant to note, which reads as under:

*“(f) The services rendered in following establishments will be counted as field service in a Unit for the purpose of promotion:*

- i. All CRPF Bns*
- ii. All Mahila Bns*
- iii. All RAF Bns*
- iv. All Sigal Bns*
- v. All CoBRA Units*
- vi. SDG*
- vii. All AWS*
- viii. All SWS*
- ix. All CWS*
- x. NSG / SPG / NDRF*
- xi. Deployment with UN peace keeping missions.*
- xii. Those personnel who are engaged with various Central Sports teams of CRPF as Players/Coaches/Trainers.*
- xiii. Those personnel who are engaged as Training Staff in various training institutions including ATCs.*
- xiv. Those personnel deputed in BDDs / Dog squad irrespective of their place of posting and deployment.*



2025:DHC:4019-DB



xv. *Period spent on course/Training including Basic Trg, Cadre Promotion Courses either in CRPF or out-side) shall also be counted towards service in a field Unit.*

*Note:- Posting/attachment in Establishments other than those mentioned above will not be treated as service rendered in a field Unit for the purpose of promotion.”*

44. In view of the above, we find that the respondents are well within their powers to relax the requirement of two years of MFS for the purpose of promotion to the rank of Assistant Commandant and petitioners have failed to demonstrate that the respondents have violated any applicable Rules or procedure.

45. In view of the foregoing, we find no merit in the present petition. The same is dismissed.

**SHALINDER KAUR, J**

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**MAY 19, 2025/ab/SK**