ITEM NO.3 COURT NO.9 SECTION XIV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No(s).60838/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 09-09-2026 in WP(C) No. 11368/2026 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi]

CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF ADVANCED COMPUTING (CDAC)Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

VIKAS BHATIA & ANR. Respondent(s)

IA No. 343813/2026 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS
IA No. 343812/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

Date : 17-11-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ MISRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIJAY BISHNOI

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. K M Natraj, A.S.G.
Mr. Merusagar Samantaray- 1694, AOR
Mr. Anurag Yadav, Adv.
Ms. Tharani Sre, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Krishnamohan K.- 2561, AOR
Ms. Prerna Jain Kala, Adv.
Ms. Pragati Tiwari, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Delay in refiling this special leave petition is condoned.

2. The submission on behalf of the petitioner is that admittedly the term of the contract had expired therefore the issue was whether the original applicant was entitled for renewal of the contract. Under the terms of the bye-laws, the renewal was dependent on Review Committee's assessment report.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by CHETAN ARORA
Date: 2026.11.17 16:53:19 IST
Reason:

In paragraph 9.5 of the judgment of the Central Administrative Tribunal (for short 'the Tribunal'), the Tribunal notices that the Review Committee's assessment report had declared the original applicant "below average" and "unfit" yet the Review Committee's assessment was overlooked on the ground that the order dispensing with the service did not recite such assessment as the basis for dispensation of service; it stated that the contract period had expired by efflux by time. It is submitted that such approach is erroneous in law and, therefore, the High Court ought to have stayed the effect and operation of the order passed by the Tribunal.

3. Issue notice, returnable in six weeks.

4. Notice on behalf of the respondent(s) has been accepted by Mr. Krishnamohan K., AOR.

5. In the meantime, the effect and operation of the order passed by the Tribunal shall remain stayed.

6. It is, however, made clear that further proceedings on the writ petition pending before the High Court has not been stayed. The High Court may proceed with the writ petition and take its own decision without being prejudiced by any observation made in this order.

(CHETAN ARORA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(SAPNA BANSAL)
COURT MASTER (NSH)