

\$~21.

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

+ W.P.(C) 928/2018 and CM APPL. 3916/2018

SAVITUR PRASAD

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rhishabh Jain, Advocate with
petitioner in person.

versus

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PB DELHI AND
ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Narula, CGSC with
Ms. Anumita Chandra, Advocate for UOI.
Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Advocate for UPSC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

% **01.02.2018**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition praying *inter alia* for issuing directions to the respondent No.1/Central Administrative Tribunal to supply him copies of the CCTV recordings of the proceedings conducted in an Original Application filed by him before the Tribunal (O.A. No.707/2017) and the miscellaneous applications argued in the said O.A. over several dates.

2. We may note that the petitioner has not only impleaded the Central Administrative Tribunal as the respondent No.1, he has impleaded the Chairman of the Tribunal in his personal capacity as respondent No.2 and a

Member of the Tribunal in his personal capacity, as respondent No.3. Though the plea of the petitioner is that he be provided with CCTV recordings of the proceedings arising out of O.A. 707/2017, he has failed to implead any of the parties impleaded by him as respondents in the said O.A.

3. Mr. Narula, learned CGSC and Mr. Kaushik, learned counsel for the UPSC state that apart from the Union of India and UPSC, there are other private parties, who have been impleaded by the petitioner as co-respondents in the aforesaid Original Application.

4. A perusal of the order sheets filed by the petitioner alongwith the present petition reveals that eight respondents have been impleaded by him in the O.A. but not one of them has been impleaded in the present petition. Further, the records reveal that on 04.01.2018, after arguments were addressed in O.A. 707/2017, orders have been reserved by the Tribunal. We have enquired from learned counsel for the petitioner as to what has impelled the petitioner to file the present petition, where judgment stands reserved in the O.A.

5. Further, having perused the scandalous nature of averments made by the petitioner in the present petition, we have expressed our inclination to issue a contempt notice to the petitioner.

6. At that stage, learned counsel for the petitioner had stated that he may be permitted to withdraw the present petition.

7. We had indicated that such a request shall be considered only if the petitioner withdraws the allegations levelled against the respondents No.2 and 3 in the petition and tenders an unqualified apology for the same on an affidavit in the course of the day.

8. At the request of the counsel for the petitioner, the matter was passed over to await the affidavit.

9. The matter is again taken up in the post lunch session. This time, the petitioner appears alongwith his counsel and they hand over their affidavits tendering their unqualified apology for filing the present misconceived petition. The said affidavits are taken on record. The apologies offered are accepted.

10. The present petition is dismissed as withdrawn alongwith the pending application.

HIMA KOHLI, J

REKHA PALLI, J

FEBRUARY 01, 2018

rkb/ap