



2025:DHC:8120-DB



\$~48

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

Date of decision: 11.09.2025

+ W.P.(C) 13999/2025

RINKU SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Anurag Singh Tomar and
Mr.Manoj Kumar, Advs.

versus

THE PRESIDENTS SECRETARIAT & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 07.07.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 2106/2025, titled *Rinku Singh v. The President's Secretariat & Anr.*, whereby the learned Tribunal dismissed the O.A. filed by the petitioner herein on the ground of lack of jurisdiction and for want of necessary parties.

2. The above O.A. had been filed by the petitioner, praying for the following reliefs:

“8. RELIEFS SOUGHT:

In view of the facts mentioned in para 4 above the



applicant prays for the following relief(s): -

8.1 The present O.A. may be allowed. The impugned order dated 31.05.2024 be quashed. Consequently, the applicant may be reinstated in service with all the consequential benefits.

8.2 Cost of the proceedings be allowed.

8.3 Any other order(s) as deemed fit and proper to secure the ends of justice may be passed.”

3. In the O.A., while invoking the jurisdiction of the learned Tribunal, the petitioner stated as under:

“2. JURISDICTION OF THE TRIBUNAL:

The applicant declares that the subject matter of the order against which he wants redress is within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal.”

4. The Order dated 31.05.2024, which has been challenged by the petitioner before the learned Tribunal, had been passed by the respondent no.2, that is, the Governor’s Secretariat, Arunachal Pradesh. The learned Tribunal, therefore, observed that it did not have the territorial jurisdiction to entertain the petition.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that against the Order of the Hon’ble Governor, an appeal lies to the Hon’ble President of India, being the Appellate Authority. The petitioner has availed of such remedy by filing an appeal, however, no action has been taken thereon, due to which the petitioner was constrained to approach the learned Tribunal. He submits that since the Appellate Authority is situated within the jurisdiction of the learned Tribunal, the O.A. was maintainable before the Principal Bench of the learned Tribunal.

6. We are not impressed with the above submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner.

