



\$~39 to 41

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

+ W.P.(C) 4989/2024

SURINDER S RATHI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Tanmaya Mehta, Mr. Akshat Gupta, Ms. Sakshi Tikamny and Ms. Riya Rathi, Advocates.

versus

HIGH COURT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Beenashaw Soni, Sr. Panel Counsel with Ms. Mansi Jain, Advocate.

+ W.P.(C) 4991/2024

DEEPAK GARG

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Tanmaya Mehta, Mr. Akshat Gupta, Ms. Sakshi Tikamny and Ms. Riya Rathi, Advocates.

versus

HIGH COURT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Beenashaw Soni, Sr. Panel Counsel with Ms. Mansi Jain, Advocate.

+ W.P.(C) 4994/2024

MANOJ KUMAR NAGPAL

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Tanmaya Mehta, Mr. Akshat Gupta, Ms. Sakshi Tikamny and Ms. Riya Rathi, Advocates.

versus

HIGH COURT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Vibhor Garg and Ms. Ishita Mehta, Advocates.



CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DR. SUDHIR KUMAR JAIN

ORDER

05.04.2024

%

CM APPL. 20398/2024 (Ex.) In W.P.(C) 4989/2024

CM APPL. 20401/2024 (Ex.) In W.P.(C) 4991/2024

CM APPL. 20404/2024 (Ex.) In W.P.(C) 4994/2024

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4989/2024

W.P.(C) 4991/2024

W.P.(C) 4994/2024

3. The present writ petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution of India have been filed by the petitioners seeking a direction to the respondent to decide their pending representations dated 20.07.2016 and 28.09.2020 in a time bound manner.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that since the petitioners did not receive any response to their representations dated 20.07.2016 for over four years, they were compelled to submit further representations on 28.09.2020 which have also remained un-disposed till date, compelling them to approach this Court seeking a direction to the respondent to decide the same in a time bound manner.
5. Learned counsel for the respondent, who appear on advance notice, submit that the respondent is conscious of its responsibility to decide the representations of the petitioners. They submit that the representations could not be decided as the respondent has received multiple representations from different persons on the same issue.



They, however, assure the Court that since a committee to look into these representations has been constituted on the administrative side, the representations will be decided as expeditiously as possible. They, therefore, pray that, for the present, no time frame be fixed for deciding these representations.

6. Having considered the submissions of the parties, we are of the view that merely because a number of representations raising similar issues are stated to have been received by the respondent, the same could not be a ground for the respondent not to decide the petitioners' representations for almost 8 years, i.e., from July 2016. We, therefore, dispose of the present petitions by directing the respondent to decide the petitioners' representations by passing a reasoned order within a period of four months.

7. Needless to state that in case petitioners are aggrieved by the order passed in their representations, it will be open for them to seek legal recourse as permissible in law. It is further made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the claims raised by the petitioners.

REKHA PALLI, J

DR. SUDHIR KUMAR JAIN, J

APRIL 5, 2024

P