



\$~52

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

+ **W.P.(C) 12781/2024**

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through:

versus

SUB TRILOK CHAND RETD

NO. JC374073A & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vidya Sagar and Mr.

Amolak, Advs. for Intervenors

Trilok Chand, Respondent-1 in Person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL

ORDER

%

21.04.2025

CM APPL. 22798/2025 & CM APPL. 22813/2025

1. These are completely misguided applications, by NIC Commutation Restoration Group and Southern Railway Audit Pensioners Association, seeking intervention in the present petition.

2. This writ petition has been instituted by the Union of India, challenging an order dated 24 July 2024 passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal¹ in OA 2307/2024²

¹ "AFT" hereinafter

²Sub Trilok Chand (Retd) v UOI



3. The present applicants, which are the NIC Commutation Restoration Group and the Southern Railway Audit Pensioners Association, was not a party before the AFT in the proceedings from which this writ petition emanates and in fact is not a party before the AFT in any proceeding. The associations claim to be a party before the Central Administrative Tribunal³ in certain Original Applications, in which the judgment of the AFT, which is under challenge in the present writ petition, and the stay order passed by this Court have been cited by the UOI.

4. On this extraneous ground, the applicants seek to intervene in the present petition.

5. We are unaware of any legal principle which can allow such a prayer for intervention. If this is allowed, it would mean that every applicant in every Tribunal in the country, not merely in the AFT but in all branches of the Tribunal, who may be involved in any application in which the judgment of the AFT under challenge before us is cited by the Union of India, would have a parallel right to become intervenors in the present proceedings.

6. Needless to say, if such a practice is allowed, it would result in the litigation never reaching a stage of finality.

7. These applications are, therefore, thoroughly misconceived and

³ "Tribunal" hereinafter



are accordingly dismissed.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

AJAY DIGPAUL, J.

APRIL 21, 2025

ar

Click here to check corrigendum, if any