$~58

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7053/2026, CM APPL. 34580/2026, CM APPL. 34581/2026 & CM APPL. 34582/2026

ANIL YADAV & ORS. .....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Dinesh Jotwani, Mr. Adil Muneer Andrabi, Ms. Harpreet Oberoi, Mr. Meahul Roy, Mr. Adesh Nandal, Mr. Akshat Kapoor, Ms. Disha Aneja and Ms. Sharanya Tripathi, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR. .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Kartik Bhatnagar, CGSC with Mr. Sambhav Sharma, GP, Ms. Aditi Bhatt, Ms. Astha Prasad and Mr. Dinesh Vishwakarma, Advs.

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

ORDER(ORAL)

% 20.05.2026

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. The prayer in the Original Application which stands disposed of by the Central Administrative Tribunal[1] by order dated 25 March 2026, under challenge in the present writ petition, read thus:

> "8. Relief(s) Sought:
>
> In view of the facts and grounds stated above, the

[1] "the Tribunal", hereinafter

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:ANUBHAV TRIPATHI
Signing Date:25.05.2026 16:19:46

Applicants most respectfully pray that this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to:

> a) Quash and set aside the impugned Railway Board letter dated 16.12.2024;
>
> And/OR
>
> b) Direct the Respondents to prepare and operate a reserve/replacement panel under CEN RRC 01/2019 strictly in terms of DoPT O.M. No. 41019/18/97-Estt(B) dated 13.06.2000, for filing up unfilled Level-1 vacancies."

2. During the pendency of proceedings before the Tribunal, the Railway Board itself withdrew the letter dated 16 December 2024.

3. As such, the Tribunal has held that the main grievance in the OA stands redressed and has disposed of the OA.

4. Though the petitioners included two prayers in the OA, the petitioners are themselves to blame in separating the prayers with the ambiguous "And/OR". "And/or", etymologically, would mean either one, or the other, or both. We are of the opinion that such a prayer clause is, by itself, inherently defective. It is for the petitioner before a Court to precisely state his prayer. He cannot word the prayer ambiguously and leave the guesswork for the Court to undertake.

5. In view of the fact that the petitioner prayed for prayer a) and/or prayer b), and prayer a) stood satisfied with the withdrawal of the letter dated 16 December 2024 by the Railway Board, we find no error in the approach of the Tribunal in treating the OA as having been rendered infructuous.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:ANUBHAV TRIPATHI
Signing Date:25.05.2026 16:19:46

6. However, in the interests of justice, we, while disposing of this writ petition accordingly, reserve liberty with the petitioners to assert prayer b) in the OA, as well as any other prayer which the petitioners may seek to urge, by way of substantive proceedings in accordance with law.

7. In the petitioners' own interest, we would advise the petitioners to be precise, both in their pleadings and in their prayers.

8. Any such proceedings, if filed, shall be decided by the Tribunal uninfluenced by the order under challenge in the present petition.

9. The writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

MAY 20, 2026/*gunn*

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:ANUBHAV TRIPATHI
Signing Date:25.05.2026 16:19:46