



\$~76

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

CNR No. DLHC010386852026

+ **W.P.(C) 12012/2026, CM APPL. 55712-55713/2026**

NARESH KUMAR AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: *Appearance not given.*

versus

UNION OF INDIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manish Kumar, SPC with Ms. Pragya Bharti, GP and Mr. Kumar Gaurav, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

19.08.2026

%

1. The Petitioners are retired employees of the Secretariat Security Force under the Ministry of Home Affairs. They seek grant of one notional increment for the purpose of fixation of pension and consequential revision of their pensionary and other retiral benefits. The claim is founded, *inter alia*, on the order dated 20th February, 2025 passed in Miscellaneous Application No. 2400/2024 in Civil Appeal No. 3933/2023, as well as the Office Memorandum issued by the Department of Personnel and Training [“DoPT”] dated 20th May, 2025. Pursuant thereto, the Petitioners submitted representations seeking extension of the aforesaid benefits to them. The said representations, however, came to be rejected by the Respondents, giving rise to the present proceedings.

2. At the outset, counsel for the Respondents raises an objection to the maintainability of the present proceedings, submitting that the Petitioners



have an efficacious remedy of approaching the Central Administrative Tribunal [“CAT”], which is competent to adjudicate their grievances.

3. In response, counsel for the Petitioners submits that the Supreme Court, in its order dated 20th February, 2025, had observed that it would be open to an aggrieved person to approach the concerned authorities in the first instance and, if required, the Administrative Tribunal or the High Court, “*as per law*”.

4. This submission, however, does not advance the Petitioners’ case. The expression “*as per law*” necessarily contemplates recourse to the forum having jurisdiction over the dispute. In the present case, the Petitioners challenge the rejection of their representations seeking service and pensionary benefits. Such grievance would require adjudication as to whether the rejection of the representations is sustainable in law. Since the Respondents and the dispute is amenable to the jurisdiction of the CAT, the remedy of the Petitioners would, in the first instance, lie before it.

5. In view of the foregoing, and without entering into the merits of the controversy, the present petition is dismissed, along with pending application(s), with liberty to the Petitioners to agitate their grievances before the CAT, in accordance with law.

6. The Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the Petitioners’ claims. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

AUGUST 19, 2026/ab