



2026:DHC:4558-DB



\$~71

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 11589/2024, CM APPL. 48173/2024, CM APPL. 48174/2024, CM APPL. 48175/2024, CM APPL. 63378/2024 & CM APPL. 32099/2025

RAMVATH ASHOK KUMAR AND ORS.Petitioners
Through: Mr. A. K. Behera, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. S. K. Das and Mr. Ansar Ahmad
Chaudhary, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Vishwa Pal Singh, CGSC
with Mr. Srikant Singh, Mr. Anurag Pandey
and Mr. Abhijit Singh, Advs.
Mr. Jitendra Kumar Tripathi, Adv.
Mr. Angad Mehta, Adv. for
Intervenors/Applicants in CM 73288/2024
Ms. Pooja Dhar and Ms. Aakriti Vikas,
Advs. for the Applicants in the Impleadment
Application

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

ORDER (ORAL)

% **20.05.2026**

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

CM APPL. 68297/2024

1. None appears to prosecute this application.
2. The application is dismissed.



2026:DHC:4558-DB



CM APPL. 73288/2024

3. The applicants in this application submit that they were not parties before the Central Administrative Tribunal¹ and that the judgment of the Tribunal adversely affects their seniority.

4. The Supreme Court has, in the decision in *K. Ajit Babu v. UOI*², which has been recently followed in *Dr. Jiji K.S. v. Shibu K*³, held that, in such a case, the appropriate course of action would be for the affected person to move the Tribunal by way of a fresh Original Application.

5. In such circumstances, learned Counsel for the applicant seeks leave to withdraw this application as he submits that he would move the Tribunal by way of a fresh OA.

6. Leave and liberty is granted as aforesaid. The application is disposed of as withdrawn.

CM APPL. 2529/2025

7. The applicants in this application seek to implead themselves as parties in WP (C) 11589/2024.

¹ "Tribunal" hereinafter

² (1997) 6 SCC 473

³ 2026 SCC OnLine SC 324



2026:DHC:4558-DB



8. We have heard learned Counsel for the applicants.
9. After some hearing, learned Counsel for the applicants, seeks leave to withdraw this application as she submits that she would seek appropriate remedies available in law.
10. The application is disposed of as withdrawn.

W.P.(C) 11589/2024

11. After some hearing, Mr. Behera, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, seeks leave to withdraw this writ petition in the light of the judgment of the Supreme Court passed in **K. Ajit Babu**, as he submits that he would be moving the Tribunal by way of a substantive OA. However, he points out that this Court had, while entertaining this writ petition at the first instance, passed an interim order on 22 August 2024.

12. Accordingly, we dispose of this writ petition with liberty to the petitioners to move a substantive OA before the Tribunal with a prayer for interim relief, if so advised, within three weeks from today (excluding the summer vacations).

13. Till a decision is taken on the prayer for interim relief, keeping in mind the principle *actus curiae neminem gravabit*⁴, the interim order dated 22 August 2024 passed by this Court would continue to

⁴ An act of the Court shall prejudice no man.



2026:DHC:4558-DB



remain in operation.

14. Needless to say, should the petitioners continue to remain aggrieved by the decision of the Tribunal, our doors would remain open.

15. We make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the matter.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

MAY 20, 2026/AR