



2025:DHC:3366-DB



\$~98

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
*Date of decision: 01.05.2025*

+ W.P.(C) 5726/2025  
RAJENDRA PRASAD YADAV .....Petitioner  
Through: Mr. Pawan Kumar Yadav, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR. ....Respondents  
Through: Mr. Kavindra Kr. Gill, Senior  
Panel Counsel for UOI.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**  
**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA**

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)**

**CM APPL. 26066/2025 (Exemption)**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

**W.P.(C) 5726/2025**

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioner, praying for the following relief:

*“a) Issue a writ of Mandamus or direction, directing the Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi to expeditiously hear and dispose of OA No. 4674/2024 titled as “Rajendra Prasad Yadav vs Union of India & Ors. preferably within a fixed time-frame considering the Petitioner’s impending retirement in July 2025;”*

3. From the above prayer, it appears that the petitioner wishes for this Court, in exercise of its power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to govern the calendar of the learned Central Administrative Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as ‘learned Tribunal’).



4. The Supreme Court in *Allahabad High Court Bar Assn. v. State of U.P. & Ors.*, (2024) 6 SCC 267, has held that in the ordinary course, the Constitutional Courts should refrain from fixing a time-bound schedule for the disposal of cases pending before any other Courts. We may quote from the said Judgment as under:

*“47.3. Constitutional courts, in the ordinary course, should refrain from fixing a time-bound schedule for the disposal of cases pending before any other courts. Constitutional courts may issue directions for the time-bound disposal of cases only in exceptional circumstances. The issue of prioritising the disposal of cases should be best left to the decision of the courts concerned where the cases are pending;”*

5. In the present case, the petitioner has failed to make out any exceptional circumstance which may justify us to issue a direction to the learned Tribunal to grant an expedited hearing to the petitioner. Therefore, we are afraid that we cannot exercise such jurisdiction over the learned Tribunal. It is for the learned Tribunal to consider what matters need expedited hearings.

6. Accordingly, we find no merit in the present petition. The same is dismissed.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**MINI PUSHKARNA, J**

**MAY 1, 2025/ab/my/ik**

*Click here to check corrigendum, if any*