



2025:DHC:4577-DB



\$~58

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

Date of decision: 28.05.2025

+ W.P.(C) 7622/2025 & CM APPL. 34015/2025

RAJESH RANJAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Gunjan Sinha, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Ravinder Agarwal and

Mr.Manish Kumar Singh,

Advs. for R-3/UPSC

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed challenging the Order dated 15.05.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as, 'Tribunal') in M.A. No.2092/2025 in C.P. No.961/2024 in O.A. No.1719/2012, titled ***Purnojyoti Mukherjee v. Vikram Miksri Foreignn Secretary, M/O External Affairs***, dismissing the application filed by the petitioner herein seeking impleadment in the above Contempt Petition.

2. At the outset, we have enquired from the learned counsel for the petitioner, in what capacity the petitioner wanted to get himself impleaded in a Contempt Petition. It could only have been as an alleged contemnor and not otherwise.

3. He, however, insists that the petitioner's application seeking impleadment was maintainable before the learned Tribunal as his rights will get affected if the order is enforced.



4. He further submits that the Contempt Petition filed and pending adjudication before the learned Tribunal was barred by limitation as prescribed under Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.
5. He submits that the learned Tribunal has erred in observing that with the dismissal of the Special Leave Petition by the Supreme Court, the Doctrine of Merger will become applicable and the period of limitation shall extend.
6. We are, again, not impressed by the above submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner.
7. Though, in law, there would be no application of the Doctrine of Merger if the SLP is dismissed *in limine*, and to that extent, the learned Tribunal may have erred, however, again, it is not for the petitioner to have a locus to challenge the said observation.
8. It is reiterated that the petitioner is not alleged to be a contemnor against whom the above contempt proceedings have been filed. Whether the contempt proceedings are maintainable or not maintainable is for the contemnors to show to the learned Tribunal. As far as the order of which enforcement has been prayed for in the Contempt Petition pending before the learned Tribunal is concerned, not only has it been upheld till Supreme Court, but even otherwise, it cannot be challenged in the contempt proceedings.
9. Accordingly, we find that the present petition is completely misconceived, as was the application filed before the learned Tribunal. We dismiss the petition along with the pending application.
10. This Order, however, shall not prejudice the petitioner in



2025:DHC:4577-DB



availing of his legal remedies in accordance with law.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

MAY 28, 2025/sg/VS

Click here to check corrigendum, if any