



\$~93

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

CNR No. DLHC010380532026

+ **W.P.(C) 11846/2026**

DELHI PROSECUTORS WELFARE ASSOCIATIONPetitioner

Through: Mr. Krishan Kumar, Mr. Rajesh Mishra, Mr. Anubhav Kumar, Advocates with Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Secretary DPWA and Ms. Shubhra Goyal VP.

versus

STATE GNCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mrs Avnish Ahlawat, SC for GNCTD with Mr Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms Aliza Alam and Mr Mohnish Sehrawat, Advs. for GNCTD. Mr Devvrat Yadav, SPC with Mr Kartik Sharma, GP with Mr Manhan Chawla, Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **17.08.2026**

CM APPL. 54716/2026. (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 11846/2026, CM APPL. 54715/2026 & CM APPL. 54717/2026

3. By way of the present writ petition, the petitioner seeks following reliefs:



“a) Issue an appropriate writ(s), order(s) or direction(s) quashing Circular No. .2(1043)/DOP/Biometric Attendance/2026/ 3091- 3098 dated 16.07.2026 and onsequential Circular No.F.2 (1043) DOP/Biometric Attendance/2026/3030-3035 dated 21.07.2026.

b) In the alternative, issue an appropriate Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to keep the implementation of the impugned Circulars in abeyance and introduce a practical and court-centric attendance mechanism for Public Prosecutors;”

4. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case, as mentioned in the writ petition, are that the Government introduced biometric attendance for government departments, including the Directorate of Prosecution, with effect from 08.04.2026. Pending installation of the biometric system, the Prosecutors were required to mark physical attendance from 27.04.2026. The Petitioner Association had submitted a representation dated 28.04.2026, objecting to the requirement on the ground that Public Prosecutors, being officers of the Court, are required to attend different courts and, in the course of their duties, visit police stations and other locations. It is contended that the said representation was neither considered nor decided. Despite this, the Directorate directed the Prosecutors, vide communications dated 16.07.2026 and 21.07.2026, to register themselves on AEBAS. The subsequent representations submitted by the Petitioner Association also remained undecided, while the Home Department directed implementation of AEBAS in district offices and court complexes *vide* communications dated 24.07.2026, 31.07.2026 and 03.08.2026. The petitioners have accordingly challenged the mandatory implementation of AEBAS for Public Prosecutors, contending that the system is impractical having regard to the nature of their duties and that their presence is otherwise reflected in the court records and proceedings. It is further contended that the authorities had proceeded with its implementation without considering the representations



submitted by the Petitioner Association.

5. After hearing learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties and in view of the issue involved in the instant petition, this Court finds it appropriate to direct that the present petition filed before this Court be treated as a representation on behalf of the petitioner, and the respondents are directed to decide the same, within a period of four weeks from date, under intimation to the petitioner herein, after giving a personal hearing to the petitioner.

6. In above terms, the present petition stands disposed of.

7. In case of any further grievance, the petitioner will be at liberty to approach this Court by filing fresh writ petition.

8. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

AUGUST 17, 2026/A/VS