



2025:DHC:11924-DB



\$~19

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

Date of decision: 23.12.2025

+ W.P.(C) 19548/2025
UNION OF INDIA & ANR.Petitioners
Through: Mr.Balendu Shekhar, CGSC
with Mr.Krishna Chaitanya,
Mr.Rajkumar Maurya and
Mr.Divyansh Singh Dev, Advs.

versus

NARESH CHAND SHARMA & ANR.Respondents
Through: None

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPLs. 81677-78/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 19548/2025 & CM APPL. 81676/2025

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioners challenging the Order dated 13.03.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the, 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 2146/2018, titled *Naresh Chand Sharma & Anr. v. Union of India & Anr.*, allowing the O.A. filed by the respondents herein and directing the petitioners to extend the benefit of the Order dated 30.04.2004, passed by the learned Tribunal in O.A.



2025:DHC:11924-DB



No. 551/2022, that is, of absorption against regular vacancies of Mobile Booking Clerks in terms of the Office Orders dated 21.04.1982 and 20.04.1985, to the respondents.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the learned Tribunal has failed to appreciate that the respondents herein, by way of a selection process, had already been appointed and regularised as Booking Clerks in the years 1990 and 1993, respectively. Thereafter, they were selected as Goods Guard as a result of a written test on 16.08.2007 and 13.01.2006, respectively. He submits that to grant them the benefit under the Impugned Order was not permissible in view of their subsequent selections. In support of his plea, he places reliance on the Judgment dated 10.11.2025 passed by the High Court of Calcutta in W.P.S.T. No. 111/2024, titled **Balram Naskar vs. The State of West Bengal & Ors.**, and the Judgment dated 25.03.2025 passed by the Supreme Court in C.A. No. 4356/2025, titled **The Secretary to Government, Department of Health & Family Welfare & Anr. vs. K. C. Devaki**.

4. We, at the outset, find that the Impugned Order of the learned Tribunal was passed on 13.03.2024. The present petition has been filed after a delay of more than 1 year and 9 months, on 13.12.2025. There is no explanation for this delay. Therefore, without entering into the merits of the challenge laid by the petitioners, we are of the opinion that the present petition deserves to be dismissed only on the ground of delay and laches.

5. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed. The pending application also stands disposed of.



2025:DHC:11924-DB



6. We, however, clarify that the dismissal of this writ petition shall not be considered as an endorsement of the impugned order passed by the learned Tribunal and the said order shall not be treated as a binding precedent.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

DECEMBER 23, 2025/sg/SS