



2025:DHC:412-DB



\$~91 to 99

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 9038/2014

UNION OF INDIA & ORSPetitioners
Through: Mr. Amit Anand and Mr. S.
Bansal, Advs.

versus

PARTHA P. CHATTARAJ & ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj, Ms.
Priyanka M. Bhardwaj, Mr. Maria Mugesh
Kannan and Mr. Himanshu Bhardwaj, Advs.

+ W.P.(C) 10246/2015

UNION OF INDIA & ORSPetitioners
Through: Mr. Amit Anand and Mr. S.
Bansal, Advs.

versus

PRADEEEP KUMAR & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj, Ms.
Priyanka M. Bhardwaj, Mr. Maria Mugesh
Kannan and Mr. Himanshu Bhardwaj, Advs.

+ W.P.(C) 10247/2015

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Petitioners
Through: Mr. Amit Anand and Mr. S.
Bansal, Advs.

versus

JIGNESH JAYENDRA MODI & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj, Ms.



2025:DHC:412-DB



Priyanka M. Bhardwaj, Mr. Maria Mugesh
Kannan and Mr. Himanshu Bhardwaj, Advs.

+ W.P.(C) 10344/2015

UNION OF INDIA & ORSPetitioners
Through: Mr. Amit Anand and Mr. S.
Bansal, Advs.

versus

PRIYANKA DUTTA & ORSRespondents
Through:

+ W.P.(C) 10345/2015

UOI AND ORSPetitioners
Through: Mr. Amit Anand and Mr. S.
Bansal, Advs.

versus

ASHU AND ORSRespondents
Through:

+ W.P.(C) 10346/2015

UOI AND ORSPetitioners
Through: Mr. Amit Anand and Mr. S.
Bansal, Advs.

versus

PAYAL ABICHANDANIRespondent
Through:

+ W.P.(C) 10347/2015



2025:DHC:412-DB



UNION OF INDIA & ORSPetitioners
Through: Mr. Amit Anand and Mr. S.
Bansal, Advs.

versus

SHALU GUPTARespondent
Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj, Ms.
Priyanka M. Bhardwaj, Mr. Maria Mugesh
Kannan and Mr. Himanshu Bhardwaj, Advs.

+ W.P.(C) 10349/2015

UNION OF INDIA & ORSPetitioners
Through: Mr. Amit Anand and Mr. S.
Bansal, Advs.

versus

SHIKHA GUPTARespondent
Through:

+ W.P.(C) 10356/2015

UOI AND ORSPetitioners
Through: Mr. Amit Anand and Mr. S.
Bansal, Advs.

versus

CHINMAY GARG AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj, Ms.
Priyanka M. Bhardwaj, Mr. Maria Mugesh
Kannan and Mr. Himanshu Bhardwaj, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL



2025:DHC:412-DB



ORDER (ORAL)
23.01.2025

%

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. After these matters were heard for some time, Mr. Amit Anand, learned Counsel for the petitioners, submits that the petitioners are, in view of the impugned judgment of the Tribunal, continuing to renew the respondents' contract for five years at a time and will continue to do so, subject, however, to the outcome of Civil Appeal 16354/2019 pending in the Supreme Court against the judgment dated 1 August 2018 passed by the High Court of Kerala at Ernakulam in OP (CAT) 4350/2013¹.

2. In that view of the matter, he does not press these petitions but prays that the implementation of the impugned order be made subject to the outcome of the litigation pending before the Supreme Court.

3. We clarify that, therefore, while we are upholding the impugned order, and recording the statement of Mr. Anand that the renewal for the respondents would continue to be five years at the time, if the respondents are aggrieved by any action taken by the petitioners consequent to the disposal of the Civil Appeal 16354/2019 pending before the Supreme Court against a judgment of the High Court of Kerala at Ernakulam, their rights to challenge the said decision in accordance with law shall remain reserved.

¹ UOI v Ajeesh A.



2025:DHC:412-DB



4. With the aforesaid observations, these writ petitions are disposed of.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

AJAY DIGPAUL, J.

JANUARY 23, 2025/aky

Click here to check corrigendum, if any