



\$~1

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1632/2025**

DARAKHSHAN SALMAN MOJIZ

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Neeraj Shekhar, Mrs. Kshama
Sharma, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Jivesh Tiwari, SPC with Mr.
Gokul Sharma, Ms. Samiksha
Mittal, Advocates for UoI.
Mr. Praveen Sarup, Mr. Sukhamrit
Singh, Advocates for R-2 to 4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

07.07.2025

%

1. The petitioners are husband and wife. Petitioner No. 1 served as Senior Principal Scientist under the respondent No. 2 – Council of Scientific and Industrial Research until his voluntarily retirement in the year 2017. He made a representation for inclusion of the name of petitioner No. 1 as his wife in the service record. The grievance in this writ petition is that the respondents have not acted upon the said representation.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the grievances raised in the writ petition are susceptible to the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal [“the Tribunal”]. In fact, it is the admitted position that petitioner No. 2, who is the retired employee of the



respondent, has approached the Tribunal for other service related disputes.

3. The judgment of the Supreme Court in *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India and Others* [(1997) 3 SCC 261] and the judgments of this Court, including in *Manish Kumar v. Union of India & Ors.* [2025 SCC OnLine Del 1519] and *Parikshit Grewal & Ors. v. Union of India & Anr.* [2024 SCC OnLine Del 6939], make it clear that in cases which fall within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, the litigant must approach the Tribunal at first instance, and only then invoke Article 226 of the Constitution thereafter.

4. In these circumstances, the writ petition is dismissed, with liberty to the petitioners to take alternative remedies.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JULY 7, 2025

'Bhupi'/AD/