

\$~29

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8066/2017**

RITU PRAKASH SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. S.D. Singh, Mr. Rahul Kr. Singh,
Ms. Kamla Prasad, Mr. Jitender Singh
and Mr. Vikas Sachdeva, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL HOUSING BANK & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Kapur and Ms. Megha
Karnwal, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER

%

11.09.2017

The present petition has been listed in the supplementary list circulated in the post lunch session on a mentioning made by the petitioner before Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice.

CM. No. 33225/2017 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 8066/2017

The present petition is a second round of litigation, inasmuch as the petitioner had earlier filed a Writ Petition being W.P.(C) 7808/2017 which was disposed of on September 4, 2017.

The plea of the petitioner is that her request for appointment of her husband as a defence assistant was rejected by the respondents vide e-mail dated September 8, 2017. I may note that the petitioner had made a request for appointing her husband as a defence assistant on the basis of the

observations made by this Court stating that nothing precludes the petitioner to make a request to the Disciplinary Authority who shall consider the request as per rules.

It is also stated by this court, in so far as the other grievances of the petitioner with regard to the holding of the proceedings by the enquiry officer / videography are concerned, the petitioner shall be at liberty to take all pleas, after the proceedings are concluded and a final order is passed by the Disciplinary Authority.

On the aspect of rejection of the petitioner's request for appointment of defence assistant, is concerned this Court is of the view similar liberty shall be there with the petitioner to challenge the decision after a final order is passed by the Disciplinary Authority. In other words, she would be at liberty to challenge the rejection of her request for appointment of defence assistant after the final order is passed by the Disciplinary Authority. It is reiterated that the disciplinary proceedings cannot be interdicted or interfered with till the final order is passed by the Disciplinary Authority, more particularly in the facts of this case.

It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merit of the issue raised in this writ petition.

The petition is disposed of.

Dasti.

CM No. 33224/2017

Dismissed as infructuous.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

SEPTEMBER 11, 2017/jg