



2024:DHC:9626-DB



\$~112

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**+ **W.P.(C) 11943/2024****STATE TRANSPORT****AUTHORITY AND ANR**

.....Petitioners

Through: None

versus

PUSHPINDER SINGH MALIK AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through:

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN****ORDER (ORAL)**

%

12.12.2024**C. HARI SHANKAR, J.**

1. This writ petition is directed against an *ad interim* order dated 6 October 2016 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal¹ in OA 3455/2016, which reads as under:

“DAILY ORDER

Learned counsel for the applicants has *inter alia* contended that although the Cabinet of Delhi Government has already approved the proposal of employment of ex-servicemen against the vacancies of Foot Constable for a period of six months or till the vacancies are filled on regular basis vide Resolution dated March 22, 2016, but, now the respondents are threatening to disengage the services of the applicants w.e.f. 06.10.2016, without any regular appointments on the indicated posts. In support of contention, he has placed reliance on Judgment dated 25.03.2010 passed in O.A. No. 1184/2009 tiled as Mrs. Praveen Khan & Ors. Vs. Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Ors. passed by Full Bench of this Tribunal.

Heard.

Signature Not Verified¹ “Tribunal” hereinafter

Digitally Signed By: AHT
KUMAR W.P.(C) 11943/2024
Signing Date: 13.12.2024
19:28:05



2024:DHC:9626-DB



Issue notice to the respondents returnable for 20.10.2016. Meanwhile, the respondents are restrained from disengaging the services of the applicants.

Order Dasti.”

2. We feel, *prima facie*, that approaching the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in such a case would be a complete abuse of the principles contained in the judgment of the Supreme Court in *L Chandra Kumar v UOI*².

3. The writ petition, directed against the afore-extracted *ad interim* order, has, moreover, been filed 8 years after the order was passed.

4. Probably for this reason, there is no appearance on behalf of the petitioner both yesterday and today when this matter is called out.

5. Having perused the impugned order, we find no reason whatsoever to the entertain this writ petition. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed on merits as well on the ground of unexplained delay and laches.

6. We would have been inclined to award costs in this matter; however, we refrain from doing so.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

MANOJ JAIN, J.

DECEMBER 12, 2024

ar

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)