

ITEM NO.108

COURT NO.6

SECTION III-A

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

Civil Appeal No(s). 7397/2016

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

GAJENDRA TEWARI

Respondent(s)

Date : 11-08-2026 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPANKAR DATTA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU

For Appellant(s) : Ms. Archana Pathak Dave, A.S.G.
Mr. Nachiketa Joshi, Adv.
Mr. Vvv Pattabhiram, Adv.
Mr. Nasadiya Singh, Adv.
Mr. B.K.Satija, Adv.
Mr. Mukul Singh, Adv.
Mr. Shashwat Anand, Adv.
Mr. Amrish Kumar, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Pradeep Kant, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Anurag Kishore, AOR
Ms. Ritika Srivastava, Adv.
Mr. Shubham Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Harsh Srivastava, Adv.

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

1. The appeal is directed against the interim order dated 14th October, 2015 of the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad, Lucknow Bench. The operative portion of the impugned order reads as follows:

“...Accordingly, operation of the order dated 11.9.2015 is stayed and the opposite parties are directed to allow the petitioner to work in pursuance to the appointment letter, which has been issued, provided the same has not been cancelled as alleged by the petitioner’s counsel.”

2. It is the categorical case of the appellants before us that the respondent has not been issued any appointment letter.

3. If indeed that be so, there was no question of the Union of India feeling aggrieved and carrying the impugned interim order in appeal before us.
4. Be that as it may, having heard Ms. Archana Pathak Dave, learned Additional Solicitor General appearing for the appellants and Mr. Pradeep Kant, learned senior counsel appearing for the respondent, we require Mr. Kant to place before us the appointment letter allegedly issued in favour of the respondent by the appellants.
5. Re-list the civil appeal after two weeks.

(JATINDER KAUR)
P.S. to REGISTRAR

(SUDHIR KUMAR SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)