



\$~16

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 2788/2026 and CM APPL. 13515/2026

YOGENDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. R. K. Shukla, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Swati R. K., CGSC along
with Mr. Abhishek Gautam,
Adv. with Ms. Disha
Choudhary, GP for R-1.
Mr. Satish Aggarwala, SSC
along with Mr. Gagan Vaswani,
Adv. for R-3 and 4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

27.02.2026

1. By way of the present Petition, the Petitioner assails the correctness of the order dated 10.11.2025 [hereinafter referred to as 'Impugned Order'] passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi [hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'] in O.A. No.1558/2025. *Vide* the Impugned Order, the Tribunal has directed the competent authority amongst the Respondents to consider the representation preferred by the Petitioner and to pass a reasoned and speaking order thereon within a period of forty-five days from the date of receipt of the said order.

2. Learned counsel representing the Petitioner submits that the relief granted by the Tribunal is insufficient inasmuch as no positive direction has been issued with regard to reinstatement of the Petitioner. It is contended that this Court, in exercise of its writ jurisdiction, ought to issue appropriate directions to the Respondents



to reinstate the Petitioner, subject to the outcome of the consideration of the Petitioner's representation, or to pass such further consequential directions as may be deemed fit in the facts and circumstances of the case.

3. This Court has heard learned counsel for the Petitioner and perused the material placed on record. It is not in dispute that pursuant to the Impugned Order, the matter presently stands remitted to the competent authority for consideration and a decision on the Petitioner's representation is awaited.

4. At this stage, when the competent authority is seized of the matter in terms of the directions issued by the Tribunal, this Court is of the considered opinion that no further directions are warranted. Interference at this juncture would be premature, particularly when the authority concerned has yet to render a decision in compliance with the Impugned Order.

5. It is, however, expected that the Respondents shall strictly adhere to the timeline stipulated by the Tribunal and shall pass a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law, after affording due consideration to the submissions of the Petitioner.

6. In view of the aforesaid, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present Petition, along with all pending applications, stands disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

FEBRUARY 27, 2026

s.godara/pal