

115

2026:PHHC:073105-DB



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-14295-2026

Date of decision : 11.05.2026

Union Territory Chandigarh and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

Central Administrative Tribunal and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate and
Mr. Abhishek K.Premi, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Kriti Avasthi, Advocate and Mr. Nikhil Goyal, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed challenging an interim order dated 06.02.2026 (Annexure P-21), by which the respondents herein and who are applicant before the Central Administrative Tribunal (for short 'the Tribunal'), have been allowed to continue in service during the pendency of the original application.

2. After arguing for some time, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that the petitioners will be satisfied in case, at this stage, the litigation initiated at the hands of the respondents-applicant is decided at the earliest so that, the Chandigarh Administration is apprised, as to

how the said posts are to be filled up in accordance with the Rules governing the service.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that they have no objection in case the litigation at hands of respondent-applicant is decided by the Tribunal at the earliest but, submits that even as per the impugned order, reply to the original application is yet to be filed by the department.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the reply to the original application could not be filed as there is already an application for amendment of the original application and rather than filing a reply to an unamended original application and thereafter to an amended original application, the liberty of not filing the reply was exercised. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in case the application for amendment of original application, which is pending before the Tribunal is decided at the earliest, whatever the case may be, that amendment is allowed or declined, it will be clear to petitioner as to against which original application (amended or unamended) reply is to be filed, which will be filed within the time frame granted by the Tribunal and thereafter, the Tribunal be directed to decide the issue in a time bound manner so that no prejudice exists is caused to the either of the parties.

5. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

6. Keeping in view the agreement entered into between the parties, as the next date of hearing before the Tribunal is 16.07.2026, the Tribunal is requested to decide the application seeking amendment of the original application on the said date if possible or within a period of two weeks

thereafter.

7. In case, keeping in view the order which will be passed by the Tribunal on the application seeking amendment of the original application, the petitioner herein will file the reply either to the unamended or to the amended original application as the case may be, within a period of four weeks from the date of passing of such order by the Tribunal on the amendment application.

8. Upon the pleadings being completed, within a period of three months, a final order on the issue raised before the Tribunal will be passed by the Tribunal. Keeping in view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with the above directions given.

9. As, there was a legitimate reason for not filing the reply to the original application, keeping in view the amendment filed, the imposition of costs, is waived off, after taking due approval from the respondents for the said waiving off the costs.

10. The petition stands disposed of.

11. Pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

11.05.2026
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No