



\$~26

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ **W.P.(C) 11307/2019**
IQBAL SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Robin George with Mr.
Yogesh Bhatt, Advs. through
V.C.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.Respondent

Through: Mr. Vivek Goyal (CGSPC)
with Mr. Aryan Aggarwal, Adv.
through V.C.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

23.03.2026

%

1. The present Writ Petition is filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking quashing of the final order dated 22.04.2019, (hereafter '**impugned order**') passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereafter '**Tribunal**') in M.A. No. 1375/2019 filed in O.A. No. 1693/2013.

2. Learned counsel representing the Petitioner submits that the only surviving grievance of the Petitioner is with regard to the following:

- i. Uncharitable comments of the learned Tribunal against the Petitioner in the impugned order, to the effect that the Petitioner is a chronic and habitual litigant; and
- ii. Cost imposed upon the Petitioner by the learned Tribunal while dismissing the Miscellaneous Application.



3. Learned counsel representing the Respondent submits that these two aspects are between the Court and the Petitioner.
4. Learned counsel representing the Petitioner has submitted that the Petitioner has filed three Original Applications, namely, O.A. No.442/2009, O.A. No.1693/2013 & O.A. No.2180/2013, which were allowed by the learned Tribunal. It is submitted that the Petitioner had also filed a Contempt Petition and two miscellaneous applications. Hence, it was not appropriate for the learned Tribunal to pass uncharitable remarks against the Petitioner.
5. This Court has considered the submissions.
6. While deciding Court cases, the Court is required to show restraint from making any uncharitable remarks against litigants.
7. In any case, the Respondent is not objecting to the limited prayer made by the Petitioner. Hence, the Writ Petition is partly allowed and the uncharitable remarks made against the Petitioner shall stand expunged. The cost of ₹50,000/- as imposed upon the Petitioner in the impugned order shall stand waived. Another cost of ₹50,000/- was imposed upon the Government by the learned Tribunal *vide* order dated 10.04.2018, the same shall also stand waived.
8. This order has been passed in the interest of justice in order to give quietus to the litigation.
9. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MARCH 23, 2026

“SK”