



\$~8

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 14635/2025 & CM APPL. 59997/2025, CM APPL. 65419/2025

ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr Kumar Gaurav and Mr.
Azad Kumar Singh, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH SECRETARY,

RAILWAY BOARD & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Manisha Agrawal Narain,
CGSC with Ms. Aditi Singh
GP, Mr. Navneet Saharan &
Mr. Rajat Gautam, Advs. for
R1

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

23.01.2026

1. Through the present Writ Petition, the Petitioners seek to challenge an interim order dated 11.08.2025 (hereafter '**impugned order**'), passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal in O.A. No. 2699/2025.

2. In substance, the petitioners want promotion from Group 'C' to Group 'B', and they had filed the O.A. on being aggrieved by change in criteria. By way of the impugned order, the learned Tribunal had protected the interests of the Petitioners by issuing the following directions:

"6. In view of what has been recorded hereinabove and to meet the end of justice, any appointment made pursuant to the notification dated 15.11.2024 shall remain subject to the outcome of the final decision of the Tribunal."

3. Undisputably, the O.A. filed by the Petitioners is pending before the learned Tribunal. The pleadings in the O.A. are stated to be



complete.

4. By interim order dated 22.09.2025, this Court directed that if further promotions had not already been issued, the same shall not be issued till the next date of hearing. Subsequently, the interim order was continued by this Court.

5. We have heard the learned counsel representing the parties.

6. For grant of injunction, the petitioners are required to satisfy three well-known tests for grant of injunction, that is, *prima facie* case in their favour; the balance of convenience in their favour and irreparable loss and injury which they are likely to suffer, which cannot be compensated later.

7. Stay of promotions would not only be against the interest of public but also adversely impact various other candidates. Moreover, if the Petitioners succeed, there can be an appropriate order for their promotion with retrospective effect. This Court is thus of the opinion that the learned Tribunal has sufficiently protected the interests of the Petitioners by the impugned order.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to interfere with the impugned order.

9. The learned Tribunal is however requested to make efforts for expeditious disposal of the O.A. filed by the Petitioners.

10. The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JANUARY 23, 2026/“SS”