



2026:AHC:42155-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
WRIT - A No. - 2396 of 2026

Vimlesh Kumar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and 3 others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Imran Ahmad, H.N.A. Khan, Irfan Raza Khan

Counsel for Respondent(s) : A.S.G.I., Anoop Tiwari

Chief Justice's Court

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

1. This petition is directed against order dated 18.08.2025 passed by Central Administrative Tribunal, Allahabad Bench, Allahabad in Original Application ('OA') No. 751 of 2025, whereby the OA filed by the petitioner has been dismissed.
2. The petitioner approached the Tribunal by filing the OA *inter alia* impleading the Union of India, Ministry of Steel as well as Chairman and Managing Director, Steel Authority of India Limited and Director In-charge, Durgapur Steel Plant as respondents.
3. The Tribunal, after hearing the parties, did not find any merit in the OA and dismissed the same.
4. Another OA filed by the petitioner, when came up before the Tribunal, the Tribunal made a query that as the petitioner was an employee of the Steel Authority of India Limited, whether any notification under Section 14(2) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 ('the Act') was issued, none appeared for the petitioner before the Tribunal after the query was made and the Tribunal, on finding that no notification in relation to the Steel Authority of India was issued under Section 14(2) of the Act, held that the Tribunal had no jurisdiction to deal with the matter and consequently, rejected OA No. 379 of 2025 by order dated 14.10.2025.

5. Armed with the said order dated 14.10.2025 holding that the Tribunal does not have the jurisdiction, the order dated 18.08.2025 which hitherto before was not challenged, is sought to be challenged by alleging that the Tribunal had no jurisdiction to deal with the matter, though the petitioner himself had approached the Tribunal.

6. Though, before the Tribunal, several reliefs were sought, now in the present petition, a prayer has been made seeking setting aside of order dated 06.01.2024 passed by the authority of Steel Authority of India Limited.

7. Submissions were made seeking to question the validity of order dated 06.01.2024 and that the order dated 18.08.2025 deserves to be set aside.

8. As noticed hereinbefore, the petitioner who himself chose to file OA before the Tribunal and got an adverse order dated 18.08.2025 did not question the same and thereafter, on rejection of another OA on the ground of jurisdiction, has questioned the validity of the said order.

9. Admittedly, no notification under Section 14(2) of the Act in relation to Steel Authority of India Limited has been issued and therefore, the action of the petitioner in approaching the Tribunal by filing the OA was totally misplaced as the Tribunal had no jurisdiction to deal with the said OA.

10. So far as the relief in relation to order dated 06.01.2024 is concerned, the petitioner could not have clubbed the said relief while questioning the validity of order dated 18.08.2025 as the jurisdiction of this Court in relation to the two orders is different. While the order dated 18.08.2025 is required to be dealt with by Division Bench, the challenge to order dated 06.01.2024 is required to be dealt with by a Single Judge.

11. In that view of the matter, the petition is **disposed of**. The order dated 18.08.2025 passed by the Tribunal is quashed and set aside for lack of jurisdiction, leaving it open for the petitioner to take appropriate proceedings in accordance with law *qua* the order dated 06.01.2024.

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

February 25, 2026

AHA/AKShukla