

\$~34.

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8271/2016**

**ROMASHA MISHRA PANDEY**

..... Petitioner

Through : Mr.Bharat Singh and Mr.Ashish Kumar  
Upadhyay, Advs.

versus

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC FINANCE  
AND POLICY AND ANR**

..... Respondents

Through

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SISTANI**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE I.S. MEHTA**

**ORDER**

% **19.09.2016**

**CM APPL. 34279/2016**

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

**W.P.(C) 8271/2016**

Present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking to challenge the order dated 13.7.2016 passed by Central Administrative Tribunal (in short '*the Tribunal*') whereby the Tribunal has dismissed OA No.1721/2014 filed by the petitioner herein.

In this case, the petitioner was appointed as an Accounts Officer on contractual basis with the respondents initially for a period of two years by a communication dated 9.8.2012. At the end of two years, the services of the petitioner were terminated. On 4.5.2014, the petitioner learnt that the respondents had issued an advertisement for fresh appointment to the post of Accounts Officer on same eligibility criteria as was published in the advertisement pursuant to which the petitioner was appointed. Aggrieved by the action of the respondents, the petitioner filed aforesaid OA, which was dismissed on 13.7.2016.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the complaint of the petitioner is two-fold i.e., firstly, according to the advertisement, pursuant to which she was appointed, her appointment was to be made for a period of two years or till such time the regular appointment is made. Counsel further submits that, secondly, the petitioner had provided details of various officers, who were appointed on similar conditions and whose services stand regularised. Counsel contends that although this aspect was highlighted in the OA and not disputed by the respondents in this OA but the Tribunal in the impugned order has failed to consider the same.

Counsel for the petitioner at this stage submits that he wishes to withdraw the present writ petition to enable him to file a review petition.

Accordingly, writ petition stands dismissed as withdrawn. We make it clear that in case the review petition is filed within two weeks from today, the Tribunal would consider the plea of limitation sympathetically.

Writ petition stands dismissed as withdrawn in above terms.

**G.S.SISTANI, J**

**I.S. MEHTA, J**

**SEPTEMBER 19, 2016**

msr

*W.P.(C) 8271/2016*

*2/2*