



2025:DHC:4435-DB



\$~58

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of decision: 27.05.2025

+ W.P.(C) 7382/2025

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj and Mr. Praveen
Kumar Kaushik, Advs.

versus

SHAHZAD SINGHRespondent

Through: Mr. Himanshu Pathak, SPC
with Mr. Amit Singh, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (Oral)

CM APPL. 33094/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 7382/2025 & CM APPL. 33095/2025

2. This petition has been filed challenging the Order dated 12.09.2024 passed by the learned Central Administration Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as, 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 3984/2023, titled *Shahzad Singh v. Union of India & Ors.*, allowing the said O.A. filed by the respondent, and setting aside the Orders dated 30.10.2023 and 04.07.2016 passed by the petitioners, and directing the petitioners to re-fix the pay of the respondent in terms of the earlier decision dated 14.10.2023 passed by the learned Tribunal in O.A. No. 656/2012 and O.A. No. 953/2012 titled *P.R.*



Anandvally Amma v. Union of India &Ors.

3. The grievance of the petitioners against the Impugned Order is that although the earlier representation of the respondent had been rejected by an Order dated 04.07.2016, the respondent did not challenge the said order and instead, re-represented against the same post the order of the learned Tribunal in ***P.R. Anandvally Amma***(supra). The said claim was rejected by an Order dated 30.10.2023, stating that as the respondent was not a party to the aforementioned Original Applications, therefore, he could not claim the same relief given by the Order passed in a case involving different personnel.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that by making repeated representations, the respondent cannot extend the period of limitation. He further submits that the abovementioned orders passed by the learned Tribunal in the aforementioned matters were in *personam* and, therefore, the respondent cannot claim the benefit of the same.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent, who appears on an advance notice of this Writ Petition, submits that it is not disputed that the respondent is similarly situated as the applicant in ***P.R. Anandvally Amma***(supra). He submits that the issue to be adjudicated pertains to the Pay Grade entitlement of persons appointed to the post of Junior Translation Officers and, therefore, the decision of the learned Tribunal would operate *in rem* and not merely *in personam*.

6. We have considered these submissions made by the learned



2025:DHC:4435-DB



counsel for the parties.

7. In the present case, the learned Tribunal, in its judgment in ***P.R. Anandvally Amma***(supra), and also various other benches of the Tribunal, have taken a consistent view that upon implementation of the 6th CPC, the Junior Translation Officers were entitled to a higher Grade Pay of Rs. 4600 in Pay Band-2 w.e.f. 01.01.2006. These orders would operate *in rem*, and the benefit cannot be denied to the similarly situated Officers only on the ground that they did not approach the learned Tribunal. In fact, this benefit should have been extended by the petitioners on their own to the similarly situated persons, rather than insisting upon them to knock at the doors of courts, thereby adding to the litigation in the Courts.

8. We, therefore, find no merit in the present petition. The same is, accordingly, dismissed. The pending application also stands disposed of.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

MAY 27, 2025

akc/my/SJ

Click here to check corrigendum, if any