



\$~64

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

***Date of decision: 01.09.2025***

+ W.P.(C) 13405/2025

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS .....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Mukul Singh, CGSC, Ms.  
Ira Singh, and Mr. Aryan  
Dhaka, Advs.

versus

RAM AVTAR YADAV .....Respondent

Through: Respondent in person.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN**

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)**

**CM APPL. 54977/2025 (Exemption)**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

**W.P.(C) 13405/2025 & CM APPL. 54976/2025**

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioners challenging the Order dated 25.09.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 2900/2023 titled ***Ram Avtar Yadav v. Union of India & Anr.***, disposing of the O.A. filed by the respondent herein with the following directions:

*"8. In the light of the above, the instant OA has merit and deserves to be allowed. The order dated 09.03.2023 is hereby quashed and set aside. The respondents are directed to calculate the interest at the current GPF rate*



*for the delayed period against each disbursement - CGIS, Commutation amount, Leave Encashment, Gratuity amount, GPF amount and pension from 01.09.2016 till the date each disbursement was made as shown in the table below :-*

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Benefits</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Paid on</i>
1.	CGIS	Rs.59,284/-	30.01.2017
2.	Commutation amount	Rs.12,60,565/-	30.01.2017
3.	Leave encashment	Rs. 6,53,820/-	02.02.2017
4.	Gratuity amount	Rs. .10,14,693/-	10.02.2017
5.	GPF	Rs. .6,86,398/-	16.09.2016
6.	Pension	Accumulated 22.03.2017 pension from September 2016 to February 2017	22.03.2017

*The above exercise should be completed within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order.”*

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that at best, the respondent was entitled to interest on the GPF amount that was allegedly paid with delay to the respondent. For the other amounts, the same had been released in reasonable time and therefore, no interest was to be paid.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners also places reliance on the Office Memorandum dated 05.10.1999, stipulating the time schedule for disbursement of the pension.

5. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsels, however, find no merit in the same. The learned Tribunal has taken note of the fact that the respondent even prior to his



2025:DHC:7679-DB



superannuation had taken steps to ensure that the amount is released to him expeditiously. It was only on account of the petitioners that the record was not traceable due to which the delay had occurred. We do not find this to be a fit case for interfering with the Impugned Order in the exercise of our powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

6. In fact, we find that there is a considerable delay by the petitioners in filing the present petition as the Impugned Order is dated 25.09.2024, while the present petition was filed only on 01.08.2025.

7. Accordingly, the petition along with the pending application, is dismissed. The petitioners shall also pay cost of Rs. 25,000/- to the respondent.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**MADHU JAIN, J**

**SEPTEMBER 1, 2025/ys/k/ik**