

\$~14

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ W.P.(C) 3157/2017 and C.M. Appl. No. 13745/2017 (for maintainability)

RUBY RANI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prathvi Raj Chauhan, Advocate.

versus

THE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rahul Sharma, Advocate for R-1,
3 to 5.

Mr. Vidur Mohan, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA

ORDER

% 12.04.2017

1. Only because counsel for the petitioner is a young counsel, that is why this Court is not taking a strict action against him for filing his personal affidavit with respect to maintainability of the present writ petition, and which is *ex-facie* a false affidavit in view of the observations of the Constitution Bench judgment of the Supreme Court in the case titled as ***L. Chandra Kumar vs. Union of India & Ors. (1997) 3 SCC 261***, and the relevant paragraph 99 of which judgment reads as under:-

“99. In view of the reasoning adopted by us, we hold that Clause 2(d) of Article 323A and Clause 3(d) of Article 323B, to the extent they exclude the jurisdiction of the High Courts and the Supreme Court under Articles 226/227 and 32 of the Constitution, are

unconstitutional. Section 28 of the Act and the "exclusion of jurisdiction" clauses in all other legislations enacted under the aegis of Articles 323A and 323B would, to the same extent, be unconstitutional. The jurisdiction conferred upon the High Courts under Articles 226/227 and upon the Supreme Court under Article 32 of the Constitution is part of the inviolable basic structure of our Constitution. While this jurisdiction cannot be ousted, other courts and Tribunals may perform a supplemental role in discharging the powers conferred by Articles 226/227 and 32 of the Constitution. The Tribunals created under Article 323A and Article 323B of the Constitution are possessed of the competence to test the constitutional validity of statutory provisions and rules. All decisions of these Tribunals will, however, be subject to scrutiny before a Division Bench of the High Court within whose jurisdiction the concerned Tribunal falls. The Tribunals will, nevertheless, continue to act like Courts of first instance in respect of the areas of law for which they have been constituted. It will not, therefore, be open for litigants to directly approach the High Courts even in cases where they question the vires of statutory legislations (except where the legislation which creates the particular Tribunal is challenged) by overlooking the jurisdiction of the concerned Tribunal. Section 5(6) of the Act is valid and constitutional and is to be interpreted in the manner we have indicated.” (underling added)

2. At the request made on behalf of counsel for the petitioner, this writ petition is allowed to be withdrawn with liberty to the petitioner to approach Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi.

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J

APRIL 12, 2017

AK