



\$~145

- * IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
- + W.P.(C) 15773/2025, CM APPL. 64645/2025 & CM APPL. 64646/2025

PRANAV KUMAR

....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajeev Saxena, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Aditya Kashyap, Ms. Megha Saxena and Ms. Shreya Bhatnagar, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Manisha Agarwal Narain, CGSC with Ms. Aditi Singh, GP.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA ORDER (ORAL)

% 14.10.2025

C.HARI SHANKAR, J.

- 1. The petitioner was issued a charge-sheet on 31 March 2023, proposing to initiate disciplinary proceedings against him. The report of the Inquiry Officer was in his favour. The respondents issued a disagreement memo to the petitioner as far back as on 13 February 2025, to which the petitioner responded on 28 February 2025. Till date, there is no decision on the disagreement memo.
- 2. This is completely unacceptable. We also note the fact that this is the third time that the petitioner had to approach the Court in

W.P.(C) 15773/2025 Page 1 of 2





connection with the same disciplinary proceedings.

- 3. In the circumstances, we dispose of this writ petition with the directions to the respondents to positively take a decision on the disagreement memo within ten days and communicate it to the petitioner.
- **4.** Should the petitioner continue to remain aggrieved by the decision, his rights in law shall remain reserved.
- **5.** If no decision is communicated within ten days, the petitioner shall be at liberty to move an application to revive this writ petition.
- **6.** The petition is, accordingly, disposed of.
- **7.** Let a copy of this order be e-mailed to learned Counsel for the parties to ensure compliance.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

OCTOBER 14, 2025/gunn

W.P.(C) 15773/2025 Page 2 of 2