



2025:DHC:11770-DB



\$~52

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

+ W.P.(C) 1546/2020

LALIT KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Anu Bagai with Ms.  
Aanchal Pundir, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sushil Kumar Pandey, Ms.  
Shivani Supriya, Advs. for review petitioner

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA**

**ORDER (ORAL)**

%

**19.12.2025**

**C. HARI SHANKAR, J.**

**CM APPL. 80778/2025 (condonation of delay)**

1. This application seeks condonation of delay of 246 days in filing review petition.

2. For the reasons stated therein, the application is allowed and the delay is condoned.

**REVIEW PET. 641/2025**

3. The only grievance in this review petition is that this Court, in its judgment dated 28 February 2025 under review, has not recorded any independent finding regarding Article V of the Articles of charge



in the charge-sheet issued to the petitioner (in the writ petition).

4. Five articles of charge were contained in the charge-sheet issued to the petitioner. Of these, Articles I, III and IV related to alleged unauthorised absence when the petitioner was posted at Gadchiroli and Article II related to alleged unauthorised absence when the petitioner was posted at Nagpur.

5. Article V reads thus:

“Article V

Shri Lalit Kumar, ACIO-II/G, Gadchiroli joined SIB, Nagpur on 24.02.2010 and posted to Gadchiroli against Aheri unit (under SIB, Nagpur) on 01.04.2010. After joining at Gadchiroli unit, many times he disappeared from the place of duties with/without permission of higher authority and failed to take interest in his duties. Vide Memo No.7/PF(Nag)2010 (4)-4317-22 dated 24.09.2010 he was warned to change his behavior and take interest in his work. However, he failed to comply on both counts.

2. By the above act, Shri Lalit Kumar wilfully neglected instruction and orders of the authority and thereby failed to maintain discipline and devotion to duty and also acted in a manner unbecoming of a Government Servant and violated Rule 3(1)(i),(ii) and (iii) of CCS (Conduct) Rule, 1964.”

6. Para 2 of Article V is identical to para 2 of Articles 1 to 4. Insofar as para 1 of Article V is concerned, it merely states that the petitioner had remained absent on several occasions after joining at Gadchiroli without permission of the higher authorities.

7. Absence from duty while he was posted at Gadchiroli without permission constitutes subject matter of Articles I, III and IV. No separate dates of absence are forthcoming in Article V.



**8.** Thus, Article V is merely a sequel to Articles 1 to 4 and essentially reiterates the same allegations.

**9.** It is for this reason that we did not deem it appropriate to separately record a finding regarding Article V.

**10.** As Article V more or less reiterates the allegations in Articles I, III and IV, and we have already held that Article IV remained open for adjudication in the disciplinary proceedings, no further clarification or review of our order is required.

**11.** The review petition is accordingly disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

**C. HARI SHANKAR, J.**

**OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.**

**DECEMBER 19, 2025/rjd**