

\$~40

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

+ **W.P.(C).8727/2015**

%

Judgment dated 11th September, 2015

S.B.SINGH & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through : Mr. Nikhil Nayyar, Mr. T.V.S.
Raghavendra Sreyas and Ms. Gayatri
Gulati Sreyas, Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Akshay Makhija, CGSC with
Ms. Mahima Bahl, Mr. Siddharth Thakur,
Advocates for respondents no.1, 2, 4 and
5.
Mr. Kaziny Raza with Mr. Samir
Aggarwal, Advocate for respondent no.3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SISTANI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL

G.S.SISTANI, J (ORAL)

CM APPL Nos.19251/2015 & 19252/2015

1. Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.
2. Applications stands disposed of.

W.P.(C).8727/2015

3. The prayer of the petitioners for interim relief has been declined by the Central Administrative Tribunal which has led to the filing of the present writ petition. As per the order dated 03.09.2015, the reason for not entertaining the application for interim relief is on account of pendency of a

Contempt Petition No.243/2013 before the High Court where pursuant to the order passed by a Division Bench of this Court, the modalities of redeployment of officers repatriated to Department of Telecommunications (DoT) have been filed by the respondents. The stand of the respondents before the Tribunal was that the matter is listed before the High Court on 18.11.2015 and an affidavit has been filed by the respondents and the petitioners have sought time to react to the same. Counsel for the petitioners, however, submits that the petitioners were neither parties to the OA nor parties in the writ petition and neither they are being represented in the Contempt Petition and in case their rights are not protected, they would not be similarly placed as the other petitioners and also serious prejudice would be caused to their rights. Counsel for the respondent does not dispute that petitioners were neither party to the OA before the Tribunal nor before the Single Judge in the contempt proceedings.

4. Heard.
5. For the above reasons, we deem it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition with the request to the Tribunal to consider the stay application filed by the petitioners in accordance with law.
6. List before the Tribunal on 22.09.2015.
7. The writ petition stands disposed of.

CM.APPL 19250/2015(stay)

8. Since the present writ petition has been disposed of, the application also disposed of.

G.S.SISTANI, J

SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL, J

SEPTEMBER 11, 2015

pst