### **COURT NO. 1, ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL** PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI (Through Video-Conferencing)

#### OA 1040/2021

Wg Cdr Reena

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

... Applicant

... Respondents

For Applicant : Ms. Garima Sachdeva, Advocate

For Respondents: Mr. S.R. Swain, Advocate

&

#### OA 1041/2021

Wg Cdr Kusum Thakuri

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

... Applicant

... Respondents

For Applicant : Ms. Garima Sachdeva, Advocate

For Respondents: Mr. S.R. Swain, Advocate

&

#### OA 1043/2021

Wg Cdr Darshana Sonkar

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

... Applicant

... Respondents

For Applicant: Ms. Garima Sachdeva, Advocate For Respondents: Mr. Harish V. Shankar, Advocate

&

#### OA 1044/2021

Wg Cdr Sucheta Edn

... Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

... Respondents

For Applicant : Ms. Garima Sachdeva, Advocate

For Respondents: Mr. S.R. Swain, Advocate

#### **CORAM**:

## HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA MENON, CHAIRPERSON HON'BLE LT GEN P.M. HARIZ, MEMBER (A)

#### ORDER 10.06.2021

The office has pointed out a typographical error in the order passed by us on 04.06.2021. It is stated that though the Delhi High Court has "upheld" the order passed by this Tribunal, in the order, inadvertently, it has been stated that the Delhi High Court has "repealed" the order passed by this Tribunal. This is being a typographical error, the word "repealed" is deleted from the order dated 04.06.2021 and instead, it be read as "upheld".

2. This order shall form part of the order already passed on 04.06.2021.

Dasti

[JUSTICE RAJENDRA MENON] CHAIRPERSON

> [LT GEN P.M. HARIZ] MEMBER (A)

Alex/Jyoti

# COURT NO. 1, ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI (Through Video-Conferencing)

43.

#### OA 1041/2021

WgCdrKusumThakuri

... Applicant

**Versus** 

**Union of India &Ors.** 

... Respondents

**For Applicant**: Ms. GarimaSachdeva, Advocate

**For Respondents:** Mr. S.R. Swain, Advocate

**CORAM**:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA MENON, CHAIRPERSON HON'BLE LT GEN P.M. HARIZ, MEMBER (A)

ORDER 04.06.2021

Issue notice to the respondents. Notice is accepted by Mr. Swain, Advocate. Let the counter affidavit be filed within six weeks with copy to the learned counsel for the applicant, who may file rejoinder, if any, within two weeks thereafter.

- 2. Heard on the question of interim relief.
- 3. Ms. GarimaSachdeva, learned counsel for the applicant points out that in this case, the claim of the applicant for grant of permanent commission had been considered in an unfair manner and HPR 01 of 2019 has been implemented in an unfair manner without giving due opportunity to the applicant. Mr. Swain, learned counsel for the respondents has refuted the aforesaid contention and submits that in identical cases, interim stay has been rejected and today (04.06.2021), in a similar matter i.e.in *Wg. Cdr. NidhiBandhani v. Union of India and others* (W.P (C) No. 5871 of 2021), the Delhi High Court

has repealed the order passed by this Tribunal. Taking note of the same, for the present we see no reason to grant any interim relief.

4. List the matter on **09.08.2021**.

Dasti.

[JUSTICE RAJENDRA MENON] CHAIRPERSON

> [LT GEN P.M. HARIZ] MEMBER (A)

Alex/Jyoti