



\$~65

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

+ **W.P.(C) 13549/2025 & CM APPL. 55548/2025**

N NARSIMHA REDDY

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shasak Jain and Ms. Rekha
Jain, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhishek Khanna, Advocate
for UoI.
Mr. M.C. Kochhar, Advocate for
R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **03.09.2025**

1. The petitioner has filed this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution for the following reliefs:

“a) Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction commanding the Respondent No.1 to forthwith clarify and notify the employment status of the Petitioner post-01.10.2000, viz., whether as a DoT employee or absorbed BSNL employee, within a time-bound frame;

b) Declare that if the Petitioner is adjudged a DoT employee, the removal from service vide BSNL order dated 19.09.2003 is ultra vires, void ab initio, and direct reinstatement with consequential benefits;

c) Declare that if the Petitioner is adjudged a BSNL employee, direct the Respondent No.2 to forthwith grant compassionate allowance under Rule 41 of CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972, salary arrears from 12.11.2003 to 06.07.2010, and pensionary benefits under Rule 37-A ibid.;

d) Award costs in favour of the Petitioner;

e) Pass such other and further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper.”



2. The respondents in the writ petition are Union of India and Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited [“BSNL”], both of whom are subject to the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal [“the Tribunal”] under the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.
3. The law clearly laid down in *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India & Ors.* [(1997) 3 SCC 261], and in the judgments which follow it, is that the writ Court cannot be approached at the first instance in respect of grievances over which the Tribunal has jurisdiction. The Division Bench judgments of this Court in *Parikshit Grewal & Ors. v. Union of India & Anr.* [2024 SCC OnLine Del 6939] and *Manish Kumar v. Union of India & Ors.* [2025 SCC OnLine Del 1519] may also be referred to in this connection.
4. In the present case, it may additionally be noted that the petitioner was employed in Nizamabad, in the State of Telangana, and the only ground for approaching this Court is that the Head Offices of the Union of India and BSNL are in New Delhi. In fact, the petitioner himself had earlier approached the Tribunal in Hyderabad in respect of his service disputes, as also the High Court of Andhra Pradesh against orders of the Tribunal.
5. In these circumstances, the present writ petition is not maintainable before this Court. The writ petition, alongwith pending application, is therefore dismissed, with liberty to the petitioner to approach the appropriate forum.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

SEPTEMBER 3, 2025/‘Bhupi/KA’/