



§~71

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% *Date of Decision : 25.02.2026*

+ W.P.(C) 2658/2026, CM APPL. 12951/2026

CT RAJU RANJAN KUMARPetitioner

Through: Mr. Mayank Sharma, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Nishant Gautam CGSC, Ms. Kavya Shukla Mr. Vineet Negi Mr. Naman Sharma and Ms. Theresa, Advs., Mr Ajay Pal, Law Officer, Insp. Athurv And Mr. Ramniwas Yadav, CRPF.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA****V. KAMESWAR RAO, J. (ORAL)**

1. This petition has been filed with the following prayers:-

“(i) It is, therefore, respectfully prayed that this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to issue writ (s) of certiorari/mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order and directions to quash/set aside Notice bearing No. M.3- 1/2026-Estt-8 dated January 2026 issued by the respondents through respondent no. 4 against the petitioner to invalidate him from his service and the recommendations of medical invalidation board dated 18.11.2025 as mentioned in the notice bearing no. M.3-1/2026-EFstt-8 dated January 2026;

(ii) That the petitioner has not been supplied with findings of medical invalidation board and prays; To direct the respondents to immediately supply the complete Medical Invalidation Proceedings along with other relevant documents to the petitioner;”



2. The challenge in this petition is primarily to a communication of January, 2026 issued by the respondents to the petitioner whereby the respondents have expressed themselves to invalidate the petitioner without disability pension on the ground of Alcohol Dependent Syndrome (ARS).

3. We note that from the communication the respondents have also expressed that, if the petitioner is not satisfied with the Board's recommendation, he can produce a document issued by a Government Doctor not below the rank of Civil Surgeon, which shall be his opinion after examining the petitioner on all aspects, keeping in view, the opinion of the Board.

4. During the course of hearing, a submission is made by the learned counsel for the petitioner that though there is a mention in the impugned communication but the copy of the MIG proceedings has not been given to the petitioner. On this the, learned counsel for the respondents has handed over the Board proceedings to the Court as well as to the counsel for the petitioner.

5. If that be so, we are of the view that appropriate for the petitioner is to seek an opinion from the Government Doctor, not below the rank of Civil Surgeon, at Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital, New Delhi by submitting the Board's proceeding to the concerned Doctor, to enable the Doctor give his opinion after examining the petitioner, which shall be considered by the respondents for further action.

6. Given the petitioner's condition at present, appropriate shall be that the respondents provide ambulance facility to enable the petitioner and his



wife approach Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital, New Delhi for seeking opinion of the Government Doctor.

7. At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, despite the petitioner submitting an application for grant of leave, the same has not been considered. The counsel for the respondents states that the same shall be considered and leave shall be granted within one week from today by clearly mentioning the period. It is expected that the petitioner shall in advance seek appointment with the concerned Doctor, and inform the respondents to enable them send the ambulance.

8. We make it clear that the process of getting an opinion from Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital, New Delhi and the respondents considering the case of the petitioner based on that opinion shall be undertaken within six weeks as an outer limit.

9. If the decision of the respondents is in favour of the petitioner, the parties shall act accordingly.

10. With the above observations, the petition and the pending application are disposed of.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

FEBRUARY 25, 2026/sr