



\$~60

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

- + LPA 321/2024
 - VANDANA SHARMA & ORS Appellants

Through: Mr.A.K.Singla, Sr. Adv. with Mr.Rahul Shukla & Ms.Snigdha Sharma, Advs. versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr.Sushil Kumar Pandey, SPC with Ms.Jyotsna & Ms.Tanisha, Advs. for R-1 & 5. Ms.Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy, SPC with

Ms.Usha Jamnal, Advs.

Mrs.Avnish Ahlawat, SC, GNCTD with Mrs.Tania Ahlawat, Mr.Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms.Laavanya Kaushik, Ms.Aliza Alam & Mr.Mohnish Sehrawat, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE <u>O R D E R</u> 25.04.2024

%

<u>CM APPL. 23757/2024</u>

- 1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
- 2. The application stands disposed of.

CM APPL. 23756/2024 (delay of 8 days)

- 3. This is an application filed by the appellants seeking condonation of eight days' delay in filing the appeal.
- 4. The application is, for the reasons stated therein, allowed and the delay of eight days in filing the appeal stands condoned.
- 5. The application stands disposed of

CM APPL. 23755/2024 (additional documents)

6. This is an application filed by the appellants seeking to place on record additional documents.

This is a digitally signed order. The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above. The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 17/07/2025 at 12:06:33





- 7. The application is, for the reasons stated therein, allowed and the additional documents filed along with the application are taken on record.
- 8. The application stands disposed of

LPA 321/2024 & CM APPL. 23754/2024 (stay)

- 9. The present appeal under Clause X of the Letters Patent seeks to assail the order dated 28.02.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.(C) 13727/2023. Vide the impugned order, the learned Single Judge has rejected the appellants' prayer for quashing of the order dated 03.10.2023, vide which a decision was taken to discontinue the project 'National Iodine Deficiency Disorder Control Programme (NIDDCP)' for which the appellants were engaged.
- 10.Learned senior counsel for the appellants submits that the very premise of the impugned order is erroneous as the learned Single Judge has failed to appreciate that the aforesaid NIDDCP is still ongoing.
- 11.As this contention of the appellant is not borne out from the record, we grant the appellants ten days' time to file an additional affidavit along with additional document to show that the project 'NIDDCP' is still ongoing.

12.List on 05.07.2024.

REKHA PALLI, J

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

APRIL 25, 2024 kk