

\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 9362/2018 & C.M. No.36307/2018 (for ex-parte relief)
RAVI KUMAR Petitioner
Through: Petitioner in person.
versus

MINISTRY OF NEW AND RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ORS.
..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Kirtiman Singh, CGSC, Mr.N.K.
Aggarwal with Mr.Waize Ali Noor,
Adv. for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER
% **19.09.2018**

1. The petitioner, who appears in person, has filed the present petition under Article 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India praying *inter alia* for in-camera final hearing before the Tribunal in OA No.1669/2017, under the direct supervision of this Court within a period of two months and further, for directing the Tribunal to pass a final order on the date of hearing itself along with the copies to be supplied to the petitioner on the very same day.
2. At the outset, on examining the tone and tenor of the language used in the writ petition, starting from the title of the petition right through the grounds, we find that they are extremely scandalous. We have asked the petitioner if he is willing to carry out necessary deletions to the objectional averments in the petition before we hear the arguments.
3. The petitioner remains defiant and submits that he is sticking by every

word used in the writ petition.

4. We may note that the writ petition begins with the following title:-

“This writ petition (Civil) is being filed under Article 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India praying to hear the O.A. 1669/2017 itself or direct in-camera final hearing before C.A.T., Delhi under the direct supervision of this Hon’ble Court within a period of two months and further directing C.A.T. for passing of final order on the date of hearing itself with directions for copies of orders to be supplied on same day to petitioner/applicant as the members are not worthy of trust and without judicial fairness.”

5. Further, the petitioner has made averments in paras 1, 2 and 5 of the grounds taken in the petition, to the following effect:-

“1.That the members of the Hon’ble Tribunal are men of compromised integrity and are dishonest to the hilt and no trust under any circumstances can be enthused in them as has been repeatedly shown and therefore either the short O.A. 1669/2017 be heard by this Hon’ble Court or in case this Hon’ble Court experiences difficulty therein then directions be passed to the tribunal for an in-camera proceeding within two months with final order being dictated and furnished in open court with copies of order furnished to the applicant/respondents immediately thereafter.

2. xxx xxx The petitioner/Applicant’s modesty, humbleness, honesty, respect for Tribunal and graceful attitude coupled with an irrefutable meritorious case has only been reciprocated with treachery, falsehood, lies, suppression, annoyance and injustice by the dishonest members of the C.A.T. and therefore the present W.P.(Civil).

5. That the respondents objection to maintainability of O.A. at Delhi was dismissed by the Hon’ble Tribunal vide order dated 01.12.17 and respondents became obligated to file

counter in O.A. 1669/2017 but respondents did not file reply and on 19.03.18 sought time of 4 weeks which lapsed on 20.04.18 and this Hon'ble Court had to compel the respondents to file a reply in contrast to the dishonest prosecution by tribunal for respondents never had a single statement to justify their false, fabricated, bogus and pernicious acts to the undue chagrin of petitioner/applicant.”

6. It is noteworthy that the petitioner is a practising lawyer and in that capacity, he is expected to show much more restraint and circumspection as compared to an ordinary petitioner in person, particularly, while drafting the writ petition, even though the cause spoused therein may be his own. However, the petitioner seems to have blurred all lines of propriety while drafting the present petition. This itself is a sufficient ground for us to decline to entertain the present petition by exercising the extraordinary powers of judicial review. Even otherwise, we are informed by learned counsel for the respondents that OA No.1669/2017 is listed before the Tribunal for arguments on 06.12.2018.

7. For the reason noted above, the present petition is dismissed along with the pending application.

HIMA KOHLI, J

REKHA PALLI, J

SEPTEMBER 19, 2018

gm