



\$~112

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

CNR No. DLHC010390662026

+ **W.P.(C) 12171/2026**

SUB-INSPECTOR KRISHAN KUMAR Petitioner

Through: **Mr. M.D. Jangra, Advocate**

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS Respondents

Through: **Mrs. Anubha Bhardwaj, CGSC with
Mr. Kamaldeep, GP and Ms. Manavi
Dhingra, Mr. Sparsh Sharma, Mr.
Prabhat Sharma and Ms. Ananya
Shamsheri, Advocates**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

%

20.08.2026

1. In the year 2012, the petitioner participated in the selection process for recruitment to the post of Assistant Sub-Inspector (Stenographer). The petitioner cleared the written examination, however, he was declared unfit in the medical examination. The petitioner, thereafter, approached the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court by way of filing CWP No. 17279/2014.

2. *Vide* the order passed by High Court of Punjab and Haryana in CWP-17279-2014 titled '*Krishan Kumar v. Union of India & Ors.*', delivered on 29th November, 2017, the concerned appointing authority was directed to



consider the name of the petitioner for selection and appointment to the post of Assistant Sub-Inspector/Steno.

3. Pursuant to the above-mentioned order, the petitioner was appointed to the post of ASI/Steno on 31st January, 2018 by the respondents.

4. The petitioner was granted seniority in the promotional post *vide* Order dated 4th June, 2020 passed by the respondents, however, it is his claim that his pay scale has not been upgraded accordingly.

5. It is urged that the juniors to the petitioner are drawing a higher pay than the petitioner.

6. It is further urged that though the petitioner approached the respondents with the aforesaid prayer, the same is not granted on the ground that the High Court of Punjab and Haryana did not grant any such relief in its order dated 29th November, 2017(*supra*).

7. Learned counsel for the respondents has invited our attention to the Office Memorandum dated 26th October, 2018 issued by the Government of India, particularly Clause 3(a).

8. According to him, there is a postponement of the Date of Increment in the case of the petitioner and that being so, the benefits are not granted. We are afraid that such reasons are not cited in the impugned order.

9. In the aforesaid background, the impugned order dated 22nd July, 2026 is hereby quashed and set aside.

10. We direct the respondents to pass a fresh order in the matter, dealing with the claim of the petitioner as is sought to be canvassed in the present petition, by treating the present petition as a representation and communicate the same through a Speaking Order within a period of 16 weeks from today.

11. In view of the above, the petition, accordingly, stands disposed of.



12. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE, J

AMIT SHARMA, J

AUGUST 20, 2026/pr/gs