



2026:AHC:50395-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 3381 of 2026

Raj Nath Mishra

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and 4 others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Shiv Kant Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	A.S.G.I., Pramod Kumar Singh

Chief Justice's Court

HON'BLE ARUN BHANSALI, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE KSHITIJ SHAILENDRA, J.

1. This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner, who is aged about 81 years, seeking several reliefs, however, he confines the same to expeditious disposal of T.A. 1065 of 2010 before the Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Lucknow ('Tribunal').

2. Submissions have been made that this Court on previous occasion, in Writ-A No. 17517 of 2018, on 18.08.2018 had directed the Tribunal to decide the case expeditiously, preferably within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of the order. However, despite passage of about 8 years since passing of the order, the matter continues to remain pending and even application seeking early disposal has been dismissed, requiring the matter to be taken up in due course, which is not justified.

3. Further submissions have been made that on part of the respondents, the counsel also is not cooperating in the matter, as when appearance is made through V.C. by the said counsel, the Tribunal insists for hearing the matter physically, which insistence of the Tribunal is contrary to the law laid down in **Sarvesh Mathur Vs. The Registrar General, High Court of Punjab and Haryana** : 2023 INSC 891. Prayer has been made that the Tribunal may be directed to hear and decide the matter with utmost expedition.

4. Counsel for the respondents has no objection to the prayer made for expeditious disposal of the matter by the Tribunal and it is submitted that

respondents/counsel for the respondents would cooperate in appropriate disposal of the matter.

5. In the overall fact situation of the case, wherein original writ petition was filed in the year 1994 and the matter was transferred to the Tribunal in the year 2010 and the petitioner is aged 81 years, the present is a case which requires utmost expeditious disposal by the Tribunal.

6. The reasons for rejection of the application seeking early disposal, despite the directions issued by this Court to decide the matter within four months in the year 2018 by the Tribunal, cannot be deciphered/comprehended.

7. Be that as it may, the writ petition filed by the petitioner is **disposed of**. It is expected of the Tribunal to hear and decide the matter with utmost expedition and, if required, to hold a day-to-day hearing of the matter.

8. It is submitted that the next date fixed before the Tribunal is 18.03.2026.

9. On that date, counsel for the petitioner as well as counsel for the respondents shall mandatorily remain present before the Tribunal and on production of a copy of this order, the Tribunal is requested to start the hearing of the matter as required hereinbefore.

(Kshitij Shailendra, J) (Arun Bhansali, CJ)

March 12, 2026

AHA/Jyotsana