



\$~87

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10053/2024 & CM APPL. 41080/2024**

SMT. JAGDEVI ALIAS JAGDEIPetitioner

Through: **Ms. Roopam Rai, Advocate.**

versus

**THE GENERAL MANAGER VIGILANCE NORTHERN INDIAN
RAILWAY**Respondent

Through: **Mr. Om Prakash, Senior Panel
Counsel with Mr. Tarveen Singh Nanda, GP
for Respondent**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

%

23.07.2024

1. This writ petition has been preferred on behalf of the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs:-

- “i. Issue a writ of mandamus and/or any other writ of the like nature and/or directions to the respondent no. 1 to 3 for completion of inquiry in a time bound manner pending against the respondent no.4 and provide the detail report of the inquiry to the Petitioner and/or;*
- ii. Direct the Respondent authorities to revoke the appointment of Respondent No.4 and consider the candidature of legal heir of Shri Ramdayal (deceased) husband of petition for the compassionate appointment and/ or;*
- iii. To grant costs of this Petition; and/or”*

2. From a reading of the reliefs sought by the Petitioner, it is evident that the reliefs are claimed against the Northern Railways and the disputes relate to ‘service matters’. Thus by virtue of Section 14(1) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and in view of the judgment of the Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court in ***L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India and Others, (1997) 3 SCC 261***, the Central Administrative Tribunal will have the



jurisdiction to decide the issues as a Court of first instance.

3. Writ petition is accordingly dismissed with liberty to the Petitioner to approach the appropriate forum as per law.
4. Pending application also stands disposed of.

JYOTI SINGH, J

JULY 23, 2024/shivam