



2025:DHC:4543-DB



\$~56 & 60

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

*Date of decision: 27.05.2025*

**(56)+ W.P.(C) 7301/2025**

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

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

versus

SH DHEERAJ PAL & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through:

**(60)+ W.P.(C) 7412/2025**

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH THE SECRETARY & ORS.

.....Petitioners

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

versus

NARESH KUMAR & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through:

**CORAM:**

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

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR**

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

**CM APPL. 32882/2025 (exemption) in W.P.(C) 7301/2025**

**CM APPL. 33236/2025(exemption) in W.P.(C) 7412/2025**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

**W.P.(C) 7301/2025 & CM APPL. 32881/2025**

**W.P.(C) 7412/2025 & CM APPL. 33235/2025**



2. These petitions have been filed challenging the Order(s) dated 29.08.2024 and 18.09.2024 of the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi in OA No.823/2020 and OA No.197/2020, respectively, which allowed the OA(s) filed by the respondent(s), by quashing the orders impugned therein and passing the following *pari materia* directions:

*“ ... (ii) The respondents are directed to extend the benefit of the judgment of Hon’ble High Court for State of Telangana at Hyderabad in Writ Petition No. 17400/2016 to the applicants in present OA.*

*(iii) The applicants shall be entitled to all consequential benefits flowing therefrom including upgradation under MACP Scheme, pensionary benefits etc., as applicable.*

*(iv) The respondents shall comply with the aforesaid directions as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of 12 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order.”*

3. Apart from challenging the Order(s) of the learned Tribunal on merits, the learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the OA(s) filed by the respondents before the learned Tribunal were highly belated and should have been dismissed only on the ground of delay and laches.
4. He submits that though this Court in WP(C) no.6973/2024, titled ***Union of India & Ors. v. Raksh Pal Singh & Ors.*** vide its Judgment dated 27.05.2024, has dismissed a similar challenge on merits, and a Special Leave Petition thereagainst has also been dismissed vide Order dated 10.12.2024 passed in SLP(C) No.



29726/2024, in another case, that is, in SLP(C) Diary No. 1868/2024, titled *Union of India and Ors. v. Ravi Krishna and Ors*, the Supreme Court while dismissing the petition, has left the question of law open.

5. Further, placing reliance on the Judgment dated 04.11.2024 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Madras in WP(C) no.1373/2021 titled *UOI & Ors. v. The Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal & Anr.*, he submits that a similar challenge on merits has been allowed by the High Court and the orders passed in the OA(s) has also been dismissed on the ground of delay and laches.
6. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners.
7. As far as the challenge on merits is concerned, this Court by its Judgment in *Raksh Pal Singh* (supra), has already dismissed a similar challenge of the petitioners. Furthermore, and as noted hereinabove, the Special Leave Petition thereagainst has also been dismissed by the Supreme Court. Being a Bench of coordinate strength, we are bound by the Judgment.
8. On the question of delay and laches, we again find no merit in the petition.
9. This Court in *Raksh Pal Singh* (supra), was considering the OA(s) filed by the respondents therein in the year 2020, wherein the learned Tribunal, placing reliance on an Order passed by the High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad in W.P.(C) 17400/2016, against which SLP(C) Diary No. 1868/2024 was



2025:DHC:4543-DB



dismissed keeping the question of law open, held that the respondents therein would be entitled to have their services, rendered as Reserve Trained Pool from 1983 to 1985, counted for the purpose calculation of financial benefits. This Court upheld the learned Tribunal's decision, noting that other similarly situated individuals had already been granted such benefits for their service in the Reserve Trained Pool, and there was no justification for denying the same to the respondents.

10. We agree with the above findings. There cannot be a different yardstick for different members of the service, requiring each one of them to approach the Court for similar benefits. In our view, the Judgment in the present case would apply in *rem* and therefore, the benefit should have been extended by the petitioners to all the similarly situated personnel.
11. We, therefore, find no merit in the present petitions. The same are accordingly dismissed. The pending applications also stand disposed of as being rendered infructuous.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**RENU BHATNAGAR, J**

**MAY 27, 2025**  
**RN/ik**

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)