



\$~38

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 12579/2025 & CM APPL. 51247/2025, CM APPL.
51248/2025, CM APPL. 51249/2025, CM APPL. 51250/2025
MANOJ SUMRANI AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. A.K. Behera, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Amarendra P. Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rahul Sharma, SPC with
Mr. Mani Kant, Ms. Shikha
Singh, Mr. Rohit Rana, Adv.
for R1 and R2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

%

20.08.2025

1. This petition has been filed challenging the Order dated 29.01.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal'), in O.A. No. 373/2025, titled ***Soumitra Mondal and Ors. v. The Foreign Secretary and Anr.***, whereby the said O.A. was disposed of with the following directions:-

“i. The applicants are at liberty to make a detailed representation to the respondents/competent authority for re-fixation of their seniority within a period of two weeks from today.



ii. *In the event, such a representation is preferred by the applicants, the respondents/competent authority shall dispose of the same as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of the said representation.*

iii. *The respondents/competent authority shall decide the said representation independently on its own merits and having regard to the decision of this Tribunal in OA No.1719/2012 by passing a speaking order.*

iv. *The respondents/competent authority shall extend identical benefits to the applicants if they are found similarly placed with No.1719/2012.*

v. *Pending MAs, if any, shall also stand disposed of.*

vi. *There shall be no order as to costs."*

2. The petitioners further challenge the consequential orders passed by respondent nos. 1 and 2, including the order dated 22.05.2025 and the draft seniority list dated 11.08.2025.

3. The learned senior counsel for the petitioners submits that the learned Tribunal, in passing the Impugned Order has failed to appreciate that the challenge raised by the private respondents was to the seniority lists dated 21.01.2011 and 31.01.2012, which had attained finality and could not have been re-opened. The claim made by the private respondents before the learned Tribunal was, therefore, stale and barred by limitation. Placing reliance on the Judgments of the Supreme Court in ***C. Jacob v. Director of Geology and Mining and Anr.***, (2008) 10 SCC 115, and in ***Chief Executive Office and***



Ors. v. S. Lalitha & Ors., (2025) SCC Online SC 916, he submits that the learned Tribunal erred in granting liberty to the private respondents to make a representation on a stale claim, thereby extending the period of limitation for challenging the settled seniority lists. Such an attempt has been frowned upon by the Supreme Court in the aforesaid Judgments.

4. After making the above submissions, at this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioners prays for leave to withdraw the present petition, with liberty to approach the learned Tribunal by way of an appropriate application/petition raising the above grievances.

5. The petition, along with the pending applications, is accordingly disposed of as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

6. In such application/petition, when filed by the petitioners, the learned Tribunal shall consider the question of whether the claim made by the private respondents was stale and could at all have been allowed to be reopened by the learned Tribunal, remaining uninfluenced by the direction issued in O.A. 373/2025.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

AUGUST 20, 2025/ys/P/ik