

31.03.2026
Item No.16
Ct. No.1
KS

WP.CT 68 of 2026
Union of India & Ors.
Vs.
Tarun Kumar Maity & Ors.

Mr. Joydeep Sen
Mr. Guddu Singh
..... For the Petitioners
Mr. Phatick Chandra Das
Mr. Anurag Chatterjee
.....For the Respondent

DICTATED BY SUJOY PAUL, CJ.:

1. Parties are represented through their respective learned counsels.
2. After arguing for quite sometime, learned counsel for the petitioner/Department seeks to withdraw this petition with the liberty to file appropriate application before the learned Central Administrative Tribunal taking objection about de-reserving of O.A. No.350/00681 of 2014 by order dated 30.07.2024 because said O.A. stood decided on 24.06.2015 and as per contention of petitioner, the Tribunal became *functus officio*. Secondly, petitioner/ Department

intends to raise another objection regarding maintainability of the application filed for execution and prayed that if such application is filed, the Tribunal may be directed to decide the same.

3. Sri Das, learned counsel has no objection to this innocuous prayer.
4. Sri Das further submits that it appears that in order dated 30.07.2024 (Annexure – P/11) because of typographical error, it is mentioned that the “O.A. is de-reserved” whereas it should have been “M.A. is de-reserved”.
5. In our opinion, Sri Das may take such objection before the Tribunal.
6. In view of aforesaid, petition is permitted to be withdrawn with the liberty to file such application. In the event, such application is filed, Sri Das may file his response. The

Tribunal is well-advised to decide the matter, in accordance with law.

7. With the aforesaid and without expressing any opinion on merits, petition is permitted to be withdrawn.
8. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be furnished to the parties expeditiously upon compliance of all legal formalities.

(SUJOY PAUL, CJ.)

(PARTHA SARATHI SEN, J.)