



2025:DHC:11828-DB



\$~62

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 19189/2025 & CM APPL. 79941/2025**
TEJ SINGH NO 10135455F HAVPetitioner
Through: **Mr. S.S. Maurya, Adv.**

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents
Through: **Major Anish Muralidhar, Army.**

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

ORDER (ORAL)

% **18.12.2025**

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. This writ petition is directed against an interim order dated 17 November 2025, passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal¹. The Tribunal has declined to pass the interim order as sought, as the OA is still pending.

2. The prayer in the interim application which was decided by the Tribunal reads as under:

“In view of the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, it is therefore most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to:-

(a) Stay the operation of the Order dated 23-08-2025 passed by Respondent No. 3 and Direction to Respondents to conduct Early

¹ “the Tribunal”, hereinafter
W.P.(C) 19189/2025



Medical Review Board from an independent Hospital in Delhi i.e. (i) All India Institute of Medical Science Delhi, (ii) Safdarjung Hospital Delhi, (iii) Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital, Delhi etc. other than an Army/Military Hospital under control of Armed Forces as ordered in the case of Vivek Kumar Vs. Union of India & Ors. [WP (C) 10625/2024 order dated 02-08-2024 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi].

(b) Pass any order/further orders as deemed necessary by this Hon'ble Tribunal in the facts and circumstances of the present case.”

3. This prayer is identical to the main prayer in the OA which was filed by the petitioner.
4. This Court does not interfere with interim orders passed by the Tribunal, as they represent exercise of discretion unless, there is lasting prejudice caused to the concerned petitioner. Besides, it is settled law that the final relief in a petition cannot be sought at the interim stage.
5. On this query being posed to Mr. Maurya, learned Counsel for the petitioner, his only answer is that he is willing to delete the said prayer from the list of final reliefs sought in the OA.
6. It is too late for this submission to be accepted.
7. We see no error in the impugned order of the Tribunal as would warrant interference in exercise of the *certiorari* jurisdiction vested in us by Article 226 of the Constitution of India.



2025:DHC:11828-DB



8. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed in *limine*.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

DECEMBER 18, 2025/gunn