



\$

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Judgment reserved on: 25.08.2026

Judgment delivered on: 01.09.2026

Judgment uploaded on: *As per Digital Signature~*

#

CNR No. DLHC010058042016

+

W.P.(C) 8820/2016

GNCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Petitioners

versus

AZAM KHAN

.....Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case

For the Petitioners : Mr. Ashish K. Dixit CGSC, Ms. Laavanya Kaushik GP, Mr. Umar Hashmi, Mr. Ayush Kumar advocates, ASI Ranveer Singh, Advocate.

For the Respondent : Mr. Chandra Shekhar, Mr. Prashant Shekhar, Advocate.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA****JUDGMENT****V. KAMESWAR RAO, J.****REVIEW PET. 533/2025, CM APPL. 66321/2025**

1. This review petition has been filed by the respondent/review petitioner seeking review of the order dated 06.11.2023 in the captioned petition whereby this Court had allowed the writ petition filed by the



GNCTD by stating in paragraphs 19 to 22 as under:-

“19. If that be so, we are of the view that the petitioners are justified in rejecting the representation made by the respondent, vide order dated April 10, 2013. The Tribunal has clearly erred in not appreciating the distinction, in the manner done by us, in the aforesaid paragraphs. In fact, the Tribunal in paragraph 7 of the impugned order, which we have reproduced above, has disagreed with the distinction drawn by the petitioners, by holding that the events held in National Shooting Championship are equivalent to events held in National Games. With respect, such equivalence could not have been drawn by the Tribunal, more so, when the petitioners themselves had brought the difference between National Games and National Shooting Championship.

20. Insofar as, reliance placed by the respondent in the case of one ASI Dheerga Pal Singh is concerned, though the petitioners have tried to justify, that his promotion was only an ad hoc promotion from ASI to SI and he had participated in different events, in any case, in view of our observation qua Standing Order, the petitioner cannot seek the benefit of out of turn promotion only on the ground that, one ASI Dheerga Pal Singh has been given the same benefit, as there cannot be any negative equity, specially when the terms of the Standing Order are very clear.

21. Though, Mrs. Ahlawat has also relied upon certain judgments in respect of her submission that the out of turn promotion is not a matter of right, we are of the view, that the issue has to be seen in the context of the Standing Order which governs the out of turn promotion in Delhi Police and as already held above, the case of respondent is not covered by the Standing Order.



22. If that be so, in view of our discussion above, the Tribunal has clearly erred in allowing the OA of the respondent. Accordingly, the order of the Tribunal is set aside. The petition is disposed of. No costs.”

2. At the outset, we may state here that against the aforesaid order dated 06.11.2023, the review petitioner/respondent had approached the Supreme Court in ***SLP (Civil) Diary No. 1185/2024*** titled ***Azam Khan v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Ors.***, which the petition came for consideration before the Supreme Court on 27.02.2024 whereby the Supreme Court by condoning the delay had rejected the writ petition by stating as under:-

“Delay condoned.

We are not inclined to interfere with the impugned judgment and order of the High Court. Accordingly, the Special Leave Petition is dismissed.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.”

3. We note that this review petition has been filed with a delay of 680 days.

4. The review petition is filed primarily on the ground that after dismissal of the SLP, the review petitioner, who had reconciled to his fate namely ‘no promotion under sports quota’ had recently come to know from one of his colleagues that the petitioners – GNCTD - deliberately concealed the fact that the Standing Order No.4 issued vide 39732-800/CB-II dated 19.10.1989 that formed the foundation of the order dated 06.11.2023 ceased to exist because the standing order no. 4/2023 no. 68457-556/CD-II dated



29.08.2003 had superseded the same. According to Mr. Chandrashekhar, learned counsel for the review petitioner, hence, in view of this development, the order dated 06.11.2023 requires review.

5. We are unable to accept the said submission for the simple reason that the standing order dated 19.10.1989 is primarily for '*recruitment*' and '*promotion*' of 'sportsman' in Delhi Police. Whereas the standing order of the year 2003 only deals with recruitment of meritorious sportpersons to group C and D in Delhi Police. In other words, the same does not deal with promotion under the 'outstanding sportsman' category.

6. No doubt, the standing order of 2003 does say that the same supersedes previous standing order no. 4 issued on 19.10.1989, but the same shall not help the case of the respondent for the reason, it only prescribes recruitment of outstanding sportpersons in group C and D; and does not grant of out of turn promotion to Inspector which is a group B post in Delhi Police. In that sense effective from 2003, the "Out of Promotion" has been done away with.

7. Even assuming the standing order of 2003 supersedes the standing order of 1989 to the extent of recruitment and promotion; we have in the impugned judgment rightly rejected the plea of the review petitioner on the equivalence of the medals won in a National Shooting Championships as against National Games, to hold the respondent, shall not qualify for out of promotion.

8. That apart, the review petition having been filed with a delay of 680 days and also considering the fact that the Supreme Court has dismissed the



SLP, we are of the view that the present review petition is liable to be dismissed on merits as well as on delay. We order accordingly.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

SEPTEMBER 01, 2026/sr