



\$~4 & 5

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 7620/2024 & CM APPLs. 31655-31656/2024**
P.K. SHUKLAPetitioner
versus
STATE GOVT. OF NCT DELHI & ANR.Respondents
+ **W.P.(C) 7622/2024 & CM APPLs. 31660-31661/2024**
MEENAKSHI SHUKLAPetitioner
versus
STATE GOVT. OF NCT DELHI & ANR.Respondents
Appearance:- Mr. M.K. Bharadwaj & Ms. Sanya Narula, Advocates
for Petitioner in Item Nos. 4 & 5.
Ms. Latika Choudhury, Advocate for R-1 in Item Nos.
4 & 5.
Mr. Gaurav Dhingra, Panel Counsel for GNCTD with
Ms. Aliza Alam, Advocate for R-1 in Item Nos. 4 & 5.
Mr. Varun Chandiok, Mr. Alok Kumar & Ms. Anubhi
Goyal, Advocates for MCD in Item Nos. 4 & 5.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **28.08.2025**

1. The petitioners have filed these petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution, for identical reliefs, which are as follows:

"A. Issue direction, writ in the nature of Mandamus or any appropriate writ or order directing Respondents to grant the promotion to the petitioner as per the appropriate seniority list, against the seat already kept vacant vide order dated 29.05.2001.

And

B. Issue direction, writ in the nature of Mandamus or any appropriate writ or order directing Respondents to grant all such reliefs, pension funds, revised PPO, as per the promotion so granted as per the Prayer A.

And

C. Issue direction, writ or order to Respondents to initiate the departmental inquiry against the errant officers who failed to act in a just and fair manner and has acted in such arbitrary manner, with malafide intentions, in order to grant the tender to particular agents.

And



D. and to pass any ad-interim ex-parte order in terms of prayers (a), (b) and (c) above, pending the disposal of the present petition;”

2. The respondents are the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi [“GNCTD”] and Municipal Corporation of Delhi, both of which are amenable to the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal [“Tribunal”].

3. Mr. M.K. Bharadwaj, learned counsel for the petitioners, additionally seeks liberty to challenge an order dated 14.11.2019 passed the Tribunal, which disposed of an earlier litigation filed by the petitioners. He submits that the relief sought in these writ petitions is, in fact, dependent upon challenge to the aforesaid judgment of the Tribunal. Mr. Gaurav Dhingra, learned Panel Counsel for GNCTD, states that any challenge to the judgment of the Tribunal at this stage would be barred by delay and laches.

4. As the relief sought in these petitions are, in any event, not maintainable in the present Court, it is not necessary to adjudicate these contentions.

5. The writ petitions, alongwith pending applications, are therefore dismissed.

6. This order will not come in the way of the petitioners seeking alternative remedies, as may be available to them, in accordance with law. It is made clear that this Court has not adjudicated upon maintainability or merit of such alternative remedies.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

AUGUST 28, 2025/‘pv’/AD/