



\$~36

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

+ LPA 461/2025

ANJULIKA

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Ajay Sharma and Mr. Digvijay
Sharma, Advs

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

30.07.2025

%

1. The present Appeal has been filed by the Appellant challenging the Impugned Judgment dated 30.04.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court.
2. *Vide* Order dated 22.07.2025, the Appellant was permitted to file an application to bring certain documents on record. These documents which are now sought to be filed were not a part of the record of the learned Single Judge.
3. It is the case of the Appellant that the perusal of these documents would show that the findings arrived at by the learned Single Judge in Paragraph 9 of the Impugned Judgment were based on certain facts that can be rebutted, which reads as under:-

“F. The petitioner was not examined at G.B. Pant Hospital on the date fixed, or even thereafter for a



period of over one month. She approached the DoE, which issued an order in her favour. In the proceedings instituted by the School against the DoE's order, the Division Bench again opined that a neurologist would be required to certify after examination as to whether the petitioner could be allowed to join her duties and the nature of her treatment.

G. The petitioner did not produce the certification of the hospitals, identified by the Division Bench, within the period of eight weeks granted, and only after a further notice was issued by the School, was she examined at Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital.

H. The Division Bench specifically required that the examining specialist would state in his or her opinion as to whether the petitioner herein could be allowed to resume her duties. The first certificate issued by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital did not contain a statement to this effect, which was finally given only in the certificate dated 09/10.08.2016.”

4. When this Court made a suggestion to the learned Counsel appearing for the Appellant that since these documents were not placed on record in the Courts below and in the fitness of things it would be appropriate for the Appellant to approach the learned Single Judge by filing a review petition. The learned Counsel for the Appellant accepts the suggestion given by this Court and seeks permission to withdraw this appeal with liberty to approach the learned Single Judge by filing a Review Petition.

5. Permission and liberty, as sought for, is granted.

6. It is made clear that the benefit of Section 14 of the Limitation Act would be available to the Appellant for exclusion of delay in filing a Review Petition.



7. With these observations, the appeal stands disposed of as withdrawn, along with pending application(s), if any.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

JULY 30, 2025

Prateek