



\$~89

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5542/2025& CM APPL. 25190/2025**

DR SONALI BADHE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Puneet Jain, Sr. Adv. with
Ms. Christy Jain & Ms. Akriti
Sharma, Advs.

Versus

**UNION OF INDIA GOVT OF INDIA THROUGH THE
REVENUE SECRETARY & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC with
Mr. Govind Sharma, Mr.
Madhav Bajaj & Mr. Hussain
Taqir, Gp for R1.
Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Spl.
Counsel with Mr. Vivek
Gurnani, Panel Counsel & Mr.
Pranjal Tripathi, Adv. for R2.
Mr. Ravinder Agarwal, Mr.
Manish Kr. Singh & Mr. Vasu
Agarwal, Advs. for R3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

ORDER

%

29.04.2025

CM APPL. 25191/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 5542/2025& CM APPL. 25190/2025

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioner, praying for the following relief:

*“ (i) Issue A Writ of Mandamus Or Any Other
Appropriate Writ, Order Or Direction
directing the Hon’ble Central Administrative
Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi to hear*



and dispose of OA No. 1117/2025 filed by the Petitioner expeditiously within a time-bound manner;

(ii) Issue A Writ of Mandamus Or Any Other Appropriate Writ, Order Or Direction directing the respondent no.2 the Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi to hear and dispose of OA No. 2385, 2726, 2727, 2728, 2729 and 2730 of 2024 filed by the Petitioner expeditiously within a time-bound manner separately and independently;

(iii) Issue A Writ of Mandamus Or Any Other Appropriate Writ, Order Or Direction directing an ad-interim stay of the charge sheet and the stay of the order of promotion of respondent No. 4 dated 3/4.3.2025;

(iv) Any other or further order as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper may also be passed in favour of the petitioners."

3. From the above prayer, it appears that the petitioner wishes for this Court, in exercise of its power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to govern the calendar of the learned Central Administrative Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'). The Supreme Court in **Allahabad High Court Bar Assn. v. State of U.P. & Ors.**, (2024) 6 SCC 267, has held that in the ordinary course, the Constitutional Courts should refrain from fixing a time-bound schedule for the disposal of cases pending before any other Courts. We may quote from the said Judgment as under:

"47.3. Constitutional courts, in the ordinary course, should refrain from fixing a time-bound schedule for the disposal of cases pending before any other courts. Constitutional courts may issue directions for the time-bound disposal of cases only in exceptional circumstances. The issue of prioritising the disposal of cases should be



*best left to the decision of the courts concerned
where the cases are pending;”*

4. In the present case, the petitioner has failed to make out any exceptional circumstance. Therefore, we are afraid that we cannot exercise such jurisdiction over the learned Tribunal. It is for the learned Tribunal to consider what matters need expedited hearings.

5. Accordingly, we find no merit in the present petition. The same is dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

APRIL 29, 2025/Pr/Mg/Vs

Click here to check corrigendum, if any