

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

+ W.P.(C) No.3264/2001

% **13th February, 2015**

SHRI GYAN DEO MANI TRIPATHI & ORS. Petitioners
Through: None

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI & ORS. Respondents
Through: None

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J.MEHTA

To be referred to the Reporter or not?

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J (ORAL)

1. By this writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners, who were the employees of the respondent no.1, and were appointed temporarily for a particular project, pray that they should be paid various benefits as per the recommendations of the 5th Central Pay Commission. Appointments of all the petitioners admittedly stands terminated w.e.f 31.3.1998 and the petitioners claim the monetary emoluments for the periods for which they worked with the respondent no.1.

2. Petitioners were appointed as per their appointment letters giving specific monetary emoluments, and which admittedly have been paid to the

petitioners. The petitioners therefore in terms of the letters of appointment cannot claim anything more and whatever was due in terms of their appointment letters fixing the pay scales, and which stand already paid to the petitioners.

3. So far as the claim of the petitioners for grant of benefits of the 5th Central Pay Commission in terms of a circular dated 13.7.1998 is concerned, the said circular does not apply to the appointments on temporary basis for specific projects/programmes, and hence the petitioners do not fall in the category of *ad hoc* employees envisaged under the circular dated 13.7.1998. An appointment on *ad hoc* basis which is talked of in the circular dated 13.7.1998 does not pertain to an employee who has been appointed only on temporary basis for a specific project. This aspect has specifically been stated by the respondent no.1 in its counter-affidavit in para 9, and which stand is accepted by this Court as correct.

4. Dismissed.

FEBRUARY 13, 2015
KA

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J