

\$~37

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

+ W.P.(C) 39/2018 with C.M.Nos.181-182/2018

TUSHAR RANJAN MOHANTY Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person

versus

UNION OF INDIA Respondent

Through: Mr.R.N.Singh & Mr.A.S.Singh,
Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

% **04.01.2018**

1. The petitioner who appears in person, has assailed an interim order dated 29.12.2017 passed by the Vacation Bench of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi. 29.12.17 was the first date of hearing in the OA and the respondent had appeared through counsel on the said date. By the impugned order, the Tribunal has listed the matter for 15.01.2018 and directed the respondent to file its reply before the said date.

2. Initially, the petitioner sought to address arguments on merits. However, we have expressed our disinclination to go into the aspect of merits at this stage, particularly when the matter is listed before the Tribunal next week.

3. At this stage, the petitioner submits that the Tribunal be directed to hear the matter for interim relief on the date fixed. He points out that the respondent has not filed its reply so far.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent, who appears on advance notice, states that the respondent is in the process of drafting the reply and assures us that the same shall be filed well before the date fixed.

5. It is deemed fit to direct the respondent to file its reply at the earliest so that the petitioner gets at least three working days to file his rejoinder and then the matter can be taken up by the Tribunal on the date fixed for hearing arguments on the interim relief prayed for by the petitioner.

6. The petition is accordingly disposed of, along with pending application, with direction issued to the respondent to file its reply to the OA by 09.01.2018, with a copy to the petitioner, who may file a rejoinder by 12.01.2018 with an advance copy to the other side.

7. We make it clear that while passing this order we have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and after hearing the parties the Tribunal shall be at liberty to pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

HIMA KOHLI, J.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

JANUARY 04, 2018

'pg'