

## **Ved Prakash vs Union Of India (Uoi) And Ors. on 19 October, 1987**

**Equivalent citations: AIR1988SC77, 1988(36)BLJR77, JT1987(4)SC121, 1988LABLC331, 1987(2)SCALE795A, (1987)4SCC584, 1988(1)UJ169(SC), AIR 1988 SUPREME COURT 77, 1988 LAB. I. C. 331, 1987 5 JT 121, 1988 (19) REPORTS 6, 1988 IJR 42, 1987 2 ATLT 484, (1987) 4 JT 121 (SC), 1988 BLJR 77, 1988 (1) UJ (SC) 169, (1988) 1 LAB LN 63, 1988 (1) LABLJ 63, 1987 5 SERVLR 708 (1), 1987 (4) SCC 584, 1987 SCC (L&S) 514, (1987) 5 SERVLR 708(1), (1987) 2 SUPREME 602, (1987) 2 CURLR 474, (1987) 55 FACLR 790**

**Bench: Ranganath Misra, S. Ranganathan**

### **ORDER**

1. The petitioner challenged the order of his compulsory retirement dated 23rd December, 1985, by filing a writ petition before the Delhi High Court. This special leave petition is directed against rejection of that writ petition. After hearing learned Counsel for both sides we wanted to look into the documents to satisfy ourselves as to whether there was sufficient material before the Review Committee and the competent authority for coming to the conclusion that compulsory retirement should be directed. The character roll entries, reports and other materials which were before them while taking the impugned decision have been perused by us. The jurisdiction of the court in a matter of this type is limited and we do not think a case has been made out where the High Court should have interfered with the order. In the penultimate paragraph of the judgment of the High Court, the legal position has been appropriately stated. The High Court has taken note of the fact that there was no allegation of mala fide against the authorities who ultimately took the decision to com-cursorily retire the petitioner. The special leave petition, therefore, is dismissed.