



2026:DHC:2225



\$~41

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 3239/2026 & CM APPL. 15587/2026**

Date of decision: **13.03.2026**

IN THE MATTER OF:

DR. MANGLO RANI & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr Karmanya Singh Choudhary,
Advocate.

versus

**UNION OF INDIA THROUGH MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND
URBAN AFFAIRS & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Chandan Deep Singh,SPC; Mr.
Rishav Kashyap, GP, Mr. Amitabh
Pandey, Advocate; Mr. Aman Sinha,
Advocates for R-1 & 2.
Mr. Raghvendra Upadhyay Panel
Counsel GNCTD, Mr. Madhur
Advocate, Ms. Purnima Jain
Advocate & Ms. Shivpa Taneja
Advocate for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

1. The petition is for directions to the Union of India to regularise the Accomodation Quarter No. 821, Type II, Sector-3, R.K. Puram, New Delhi 110022 (said accommodation) in favour of the petitioner.



2026:DHC:2225



2. *Vide* order dated 02.02.2026, in view of the petitioners' submission that they would prefer to stay in 'Type-II' accommodation although they were entitled to a higher category of 'Type IV' accommodation, and that regularisation has been allowed in similarly situated cases, the Court had directed the respondents to reconsider the petitioner's claim and pass a fresh order. Pursuant to the said directions, the respondents have passed a speaking order on 03.03.2026. In the said order, it is recorded that the said accommodation has been placed in 'Departmental Pool' with effect from 07.02.2008 and is reserved to be allocated to employees of the Delhi Police.

3. According to Office Memorandum dated 17.09.2018 spouses/wards of employees working in the eligible office of the Government of NCT of Delhi may be considered for regularisation or accommodation, subject to applicable terms and conditions. However, as per the footnote of the said Office Memorandum, school teachers and other staff posted in the Delhi Administration are not eligible for allotment of General Pool Residential Accommodation. The relevant portion of the said Office Memorandum is extracted below, for reference:

"N.B.2: All Branch Offices/Regional Offices Administration Offices of the Offices of Delhi Admn. Mentioned in Para 'B' of this list will also be treated as eligible offices. The Delhi Admn. School Teachers and other staff posted in schools will, however, not be eligible for allotment of General Pool Residential Accommodation."

(Emphasis supplied)

4. Petitioner no.1 is a school teacher working with the Delhi Administration. Therefore, it is seen that as per the said Office Memorandum, the petitioner does not have any vested right of allotment of the said accommodation in her favour.



2026:DHC:2225



5. The parity claimed by the petitioner with the case of another Government employee has been addressed by the respondent. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that the said employee was an employee in the office of the District and Sessions Judge, Tis Hazari Court, New Delhi which is an eligible office for allotment/regularisation of GPRA. Therefore, according to him, the said case is different from that of the petitioners.

6. In view of the aforesaid, no illegality is found in the impugned decision. The petition is, therefore, dismissed.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 13, 2026/P