



2025:DHC:1041-DB



\$~79

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 772/2018

TILAK RAJ SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Anju Gupta with
Mr. Bhuvan Goel and Mr. Shubham Grover,
Advs for R-1, 2 & 3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

%

18.02.2025

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

REVIEW PET. 87/2025

1. This review petition seeks review of the judgment dated 17 January 2025 passed by us whereby we have dismissed WP (C) 772/2018.

2. The issue in the writ petition pertained to LTC¹ availed by the review petitioner, who was the petitioner in the writ petition. The LTC was originally sought for travel to Trivandrum, which was subsequently changed to Goa, via Mumbai. The petitioner decided,

¹ Leave Travel Concession



midway, to change his destination certain hillstations in Uttarakhand.

3. In our judgment, we have taken note of the relevant instructions which unmistakably require prior permission of the competent authority to be taken in the event of change of destination midway. It is only where unavoidable circumstances exist, as would make it impossible to take such prior permission, that change of LTC can be granted even if there is change of destination.

4. The petitioner, who appears in person submits that he had to change his destination owing to unavoidable circumstances. We had noted, in our judgment, that, in the representation made by him on 14 June 2013, seeking LTC, the only ground taken was that. As the route to Goa was very long, the petitioner had decided to change his destination to places in Uttarakhand, as already noted.

5. We have opined that this could not constitute “unavoidable circumstances”, as would justify dispensation with the requirement of prior permission before changing destination.

6. It is on this basis that we have upheld the decision of the Central Administrative Tribunal to reject the petitioner’s Original Application.

7. The petitioner, who appears in person, submits that, if the respondents was inclined to extend the petitioner’s application for LTC, it ought to have been done within ten days instead of making the petitioner wait for one and a half years. He further submits that there



2025:DHC:1041-DB



has been a history of victimization of the petitioner by the respondents, owing to which the petitioner has sought to file various cases against the respondents, including a petition for compensation pending in Patiala House Court.

8. He further submits that the delay in deciding the petitioner's representation of LTC for one and a half years was only because the respondents wanted to blackmail the petitioner.

9. These are all submissions which cannot be examined by us in exercise of writ jurisdiction. Besides, they do not constitute, by any stretch of imagination, grounds for review of our judgment, which has been passed strictly in terms of the applicable policy.

10. No case for review exists. The review petition is dismissed.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

AJAY DIGPAUL, J.

FEBRUARY 18, 2025

an

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)