



2025:DHC:5885-DB



\$~108

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ W.P.(C) 10370/2025, CM APPL. 42997/2025 & CM APPL.  
42998/2025

RAVINDER KUMAR LUTHRA .....Petitioner  
Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Mr.  
Anshuman Mehrotra and Mr. Nikunj Arora,  
Advs.

versus

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA AND ANR  
.....Respondents  
Through: Mr. Sidhant Kumar, Mr. Vishal  
Chanda and Mr. Om Batra, Advs.

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

**ORDER [ORAL]**  
**22.07.2025**

%

**C. HARI SHANKAR, J.**

1. The order under challenge, passed by the Central  
Administrative Tribunal<sup>1</sup> on 9 July 2025, reads thus:

**“Order of the Tribunal**

Heard.

Issue notice to the respondents.

Learned counsel for the respondents appears and accepts notice.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Tribunal” hereinafter



2025:DHC:5885-DB



Four weeks time is granted to the respondents to file reply. Two weeks' time thereafter is granted to the applicant to file rejoinder, if any.

List on 25.09.2025.”

2. We have heard Mr. Chhibber, learned Counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Sidhant Kumar, learned Counsel for the respondents at length.
3. Mr. Chhibber submits that the petitioner is facing dire circumstances and it was for that reason that the petitioner had moved the Tribunal for interim relief. He submits that on earlier occasions his client has been given protection even by this Court. Nonetheless, he submits, the Tribunal has not condescended to pass any order one way or the other on the petitioner's prayer for interim relief.
4. We note, from the impugned order, that it does not indicate that there is a conscious decision by the Tribunal *not* to grant any *ad* interim relief to the petitioner.
5. Given the aforesaid submissions advanced by Mr. Chhibber, we deem it appropriate, in the interests of justice, to dispose of this writ petition with a request to the Tribunal to consider the petitioner's prayer for *ad* interim relief, in terms of the interim prayer contained in para 9 of the OA, on 25 July 2025.
6. On the said date, the Tribunal is requested to take a view as to



2025:DHC:5885-DB



whether the petitioner should or should not be granted any *ad interim* relief.

7. We make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case. The Tribunal would be entirely within its jurisdiction to take up an appropriate view. Should the petitioner continue to remain aggrieved, his rights in law would remain reserved.

8. Both parties are, therefore, directed to present themselves before the Tribunal on 25 July 2025. Learned Counsel for the parties undertake that they would not seek any adjournment on that date.

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

10. *Dasti* under signature of the Court Master.

**C. HARI SHANKAR, J.**

**OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.**

**JULY 22, 2025**

AR