



2025:DHC:6693-DB



\$~1 (SPL. DB)

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

+ W.P.(C) 5877/2022 & CM APPL. 32341/2025, CM APPL. 32342/2025, REVIEW PET. 329/2025

DIWAKAR PANDE & ORSPetitioners

Through: Mr. Ajay Sharma, Adv.

versus

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS & ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Mukul Singh, CGSC with
Mr. Adhiraj Singh, Adv. for R-1

Mr. Ravinder Agarwal, Mr. Manish Kumar
Singh & Mr. Vasu Agarwal, Advs. for R-
3/UPSC

Insp. Prahla Devenda

AC Sunder Lal, Insp Sanjay Kumar, SI
Rahul Sinha, CISF

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINDER KAUR

ORDER (ORAL)

%

08.08.2025

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

REVIEW PET. 329/2025 & CM APPL. 32341/2025, CM APPL. 32342/2025

1. This review petition seeks a review of the following order passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court:

“1. On the last date, this Court after hearing learned counsel for the petitioner at length had observed that no directions could be issued to the respondents to comply with the reports of the Parliamentary Committee, and therefore the relief as sought by the petitioners could not be granted. Consequently, time was granted to the learned counsel to obtain instructions as to whether the



petitioners would be, for the present, satisfied, if this, Court were to direct the respondents to conduct a cadre review for the post of Inspector (Executive) and Assistant Commandant (Executive) in the CISF in a time bound manner.

2. Today, the learned senior counsel for the petitioner appears and submits that as per his instructions, this cadre review is already underway. The petitioners, however, apprehend that this cadre review may be finalised without taking into account that for want of adequate vacancies in the promotional post of Assistant Commandant, the petitioners and other Inspectors in the CISF are stagnating on the post of Inspector for about 19 to 20 years, even though 5 years has been prescribed as eligibility criteria for promotion under the recruitment rules. He, therefore, prays that this Court, while directing the respondents to complete the pending cadre review within a specific time frame, may also direct them to take into account the guidelines issued by the UPSC and the various OMs issued by the DoP&T providing for grant of relaxation of the laid down promotional quota.

3. The learned counsel for the respondents submits, that the petitioners are correct in urging that the cadre review of the posts of Inspector(Executive) and Assistant Commandant is already underway. He submits that the report of the cadre review of the entire executive cadre of the CISF, is being finalized and is likely to be forwarded to the competent authority within three weeks, whereafter, a considered decision thereon will be taken by the competent authority as expeditiously as possible.

4. In the light of this stand taken by the parties, we are of the view that while it is not for this Court to issue any such directions to the respondents at this stage regarding the manner in which the cadre review should be conducted, the grievance of the petitioners that they are stagnating for years together cannot be simply brushed aside. We, however, are of the opinion that while conducting the exercise of cadre review of the Executive Cadre in the CISF, the respondents must ensure that adequate promotional avenues are created for the personnel/officers so that they do not stagnate in the same post for years together. We, therefore, dispose of the writ petition by directing the respondents to finalise the process of cadre review of the CISF Executive Cadre within a period of four months. We further direct, that while finalizing the cadre review, the respondents will take into account the guidelines and OMs issued by the UPSC and the DoP&T for providing appropriate promotional avenues to the employees.



2025:DHC:6693-DB



5. Needless to state, in case, the petitioners are still aggrieved by any orders passed by the respondents, it will be open for them to seek legal recourse as permissible in law.”
2. The aforesaid order contains substantially only two directions. The first is to finalise the process of cadre review of CISF within a period of four months as mentioned in the order. The second is to ensure that, while doing so, adequate promotional avenues are provided and the guidelines and OMs issued by the UPSC and DOPT in that regard are borne in mind.
3. Despite queries from the Court, Mr. Ajay Sharma is unable to point any error apparent in either of these directions.
4. The review petition with accompanying applications are accordingly dismissed.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

SHALINDER KAUR, J.

AUGUST 8, 2025

AR