



\$~41

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

% *Date of Decision : 20.01.2026*

+ W.P.(C) 16005/2022, CM APPL. 49938/2022

SER MOHAMMED SK

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pavan Kumar and Mr. Akhlesh
K. Soni, Advs.

versus

CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL SECURITY FORCE & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Neha Rastogi, SPC, Mr. Animesh
Rastogi, Mr. Shashank Pandey, Mr.
Rajat Dubey, Advs., Mr. V.S Rawat,
AC and Inspector Sanjay.

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:-

*“a) Quash the office orders dated 08.6.2022,
29.6.2022 and 26.8.2022 passed by the Respondent
Nos.1 to 3;*

*b) Reinstate the Petitioner in service to the post of
Constable in the Respondent-Department with all
consequential benefits to meet the ends of justice; and”*

2. The challenge is primarily to the office orders dated 08.06.2020,



26.08.2020 and 29.06.2022, whereby, the petitioner was removed from service without being disqualified for future employment and the review thereof against the said order has been rejected.

3. The petitioner had applied for appointment to the post of Constable (Tradesmen), which includes Barber, Boot Maker, Cook etc. On 18.01.2017, he was recruited as Constable Tradesman (Barber) in the respondents/Central Industrial Security Force (“CISF”) and was given an offer letter dated 18.01.2017.

4. On 07.02.2017, on a complaint made against the petitioner that he has submitted a fake Industrial Training Institute (“ITI”) certificate at the time of selection to the post of Constable Tradesman (Barber) and upon verification of the documents, it was found that the ITI certificate submitted by the petitioner was not genuine. The aforesaid resulted in a decision to conduct a departmental enquiry under Rule 36 of the CISF Rules, 2001 and accordingly, a charge-sheet dated 20.03.2020 was issued to the petitioner wherein Articles of charges were framed against the petitioner.

5. It is a conceded case that the charges against the petitioner have been proved by the enquiry officer, which finally resulted in his removal from service without disqualification for future employment under the Government. The appeal and the review thereof have also been rejected by the said authorities.

6. The submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is primarily that the qualification of ITI in the concerned trade is not an eligibility for appointment to the post of Constable Tradesman (Barber) and as such, even if certificate, is fake, the same would not have a bearing insofar as the appointment is concerned.

