



2025:DHC:9203-DB



\$~119

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6179/2025**

SURESH KUMAR YADAV AND ORSPetitioners

Through: **Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Adv.**

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents

Through: **Mr. Vinay Yadav, CGSC, Mr. Neeraj Paulose Raj, Mr. Ansh Karla and Ms. Kamna Behrani, Advs.**

Mr Ajay Pal Law Officer and Mr Ramniwas Yadav CRPF

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

% **15.10.2025**

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. The issue in controversy is to the entitlement of the petitioners to the grade pay of ₹ 5400 after having served for four years in the grade pay of ₹ 4800.

2. The issue is covered by the various judgments of this Court including,

- (i) judgment dated 9 September 2024 in WP(C) 690/2022 (*Sushil Kumar v Union of India*¹), which was affirmed by the Supreme Court on merits by order dated 17 April 2025 in SLP(C) 13406/2025 (*Union of India v Sushil Kumar*),

¹ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 6482



2025:DHC:9203-DB



- (ii) judgment dated 12 February 2025 in WP(C) 1743/2025 (*Anand Pratap Singh v Union of India*) and
- (iii) judgment dated 10 March 2025 in WP(C) 3018/2025 (*Gajendra Singh v Union of India*²).

3. Mr. Vinay Yadav, learned CGSC, candidly acknowledges this position but submits that the department is in the process of filing a review petition, even after the SLP against the decision in *Sushil Kumar* has been dismissed.

4. Nonetheless, given the above position, the petitioners are clearly entitled to the reliefs sought.

5. Accordingly, this writ petition is allowed.

6. The petitioners are held to be entitled to the grade pay of ₹ 5400 on completion of four years in the grade pay of ₹ 4800.

7. Let the re-fixation of pay as well as arrears be provided to the petitioners within a period of eight weeks from today.

8. The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.

OCTOBER 15, 2025/dsn