

CWP-29236-2025 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

107

CWP-29236-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision :10.11.2025

K. Raja Raman, Chairman & Secretary (T)
Department of Telecommunication & another ... Petitioners

Versus

Sudhir Chadha and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present: Mr. Anish Babbar, Advocate & Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 05.08.2025 (Annexure P-2) passed by respondent No.5-Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, (hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal') whereby petitioners herein were directed to comply with the order dated 31.07.2000 passed by the Tribunal i.e. to consider the case of respondents herein on basis of judgments of Ernakulam Bench and Bangalore Bench, failing which, petitioners herein were directed to remain present in person for consideration of framing of charges under the Contempt of Court Act.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the grievance of the petitioners is qua the fact that the presence of the officers concerned i.e.

petitioners is being called for vide the impugned order dated 05.08.2025

(Annexure P-2), which should be interfered with by this Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the entire relief for which the respondents were entitled for, have already been granted to them and nothing has come on record that the relief which has been granted to the similarly situated employees, has not been extended in favour of the respondents and even if, there is any query of the Tribunal while dealing with the said issue, the same will be brought to the notice of the Tribunal by way of filing an affidavit and hence, till it becomes absolutely necessary to seek the presence of the petitioners, they should not be called in person.

4. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and have gone through the record with his able assistance.

5. It may be noticed that the only observation made by the Tribunal in the impugned order dated 05.08.2025 (Annexure P-2) is that in case the order dated 31.07.2000 is not complied with by the petitioners herein, the officers concerned will remain present in Court. However, if the order dated 31.07.2000 is complied with, there is no such order passed by the Tribunal directing the petitioners to come present in Court.

6. Further, keeping in view the fact that the petitioners have already undertaken before this Court to file an affidavit before the Tribunal to the effect that all the similarly situated employees have been given the same benefit without any discrimination including the respondents, let the said affidavit be filed before the Tribunal for consideration and thereafter, the Tribunal will pass an appropriate order that whether all the concerned employees have been treated in a similar fashion or not while deciding the petition of respondents herein which is pending.

7. Further, the Tribunal is requested that till it becomes necessary to seek the presence of the petitioners, no such order be passed and in case, the presence of the petitioners is necessary then, all the efforts be made to get it resorted through Video conferencing if feasible.
8. Present petition is disposed of with the above observations.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

November 10, 2025	(VIKAS SURI)
aarti	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether reportable :	No