

17

\$~26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 42, 49, 50, 51 and 59

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ W.P.(C) 1259/2014

DR RAGHUBIR VEDALANKAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prateek Yadav, Advocate with
Mr. Sanjeev Sahay, Advocate.

versus

DELHI UNIVERSITY & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Advocate
for University of Delhi.
Mr. Ravinder Aggarwal, Advocate for
respondent No.2.

+ W.P.(C) 3318/2014

NIRMAL KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prateek Dahiya, Advocate.
versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Advocate
for University of Delhi.
Ms. Beenashaw N. Soni, Advocate
for respondent No.2.
Mr. Ravinder Aggarwal, Advocate for
respondent No.3.

+ W.P.(C) 4721/2014

MAN MOHAN KAUR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shankar Raju, Advocate.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Advocate
for University of Delhi.

W.P.(C) No.1259/2014 & conn. matters

page 1 of 6

Signature Not Verified

Signing Date: 27.09.2024 16:59:40
Certify that the digital and physical file have
been compared and the digital data is as per
the physical file and no page is missing.

+ W.P.(C) 7766/2014

KAMLESH MALHOTRA & ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Tanuj Khurana, Advocate with
Mr. P. Chaitanyashil, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Advocate
for University of Delhi.
Ms. Beenashaw N. Soni, Advocate
with Mr. Aakash Yadav, Advocate for
respondent No.5.

+ W.P.(C) 558/2015

NIRMAL AHLUWALIA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Malaya Kumar Chand, Advocate
with Mr. Shivam Pandey, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Advocate
for University of Delhi.
Mr. R.P. Sharma, Advocate with Mr.
Vaibhav Mehra, Advocate for
respondent No.4.

+ W.P.(C) 8068/2015

KATYAYANI PRASAD BENJWAL & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Tanuj Khurana, Advocate with
Mr. P. Chaitanyashil, Advocate.

Versus

W.P.(C) No.1259/2014 & conn. matters

page 2 of 6

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Advocate
for University of Delhi.

+ W.P.(C) 290/2016 and C.M. No.1194/2016 (directions)

GOPAL JI

..... Petitioner

Through: None.
versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Advocate
for University of Delhi.
Mr. Amit Bansal, Advocate with Ms.
Seema Dolo, Advocate with Ms.
Surbhi Mehta, Advocate for
respondent No.2.

+ W.P.(C) 292/2016 and C.M. No.1200/2016 (for directions)

RAMESH CHAND GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Advocate
for University of Delhi.
Mr. Amit Bansal, Advocate with Ms.
Seema Dolo, Advocate with Ms.
Surbhi Mehta, Advocate for
respondent No.2.

+ W.P.(C) 337/2016 and C.M. No.1381/2016 (for ad interim stay)

A.P. SURI

..... Petitioner

Through: None.

Versus

W.P.(C) No.1259/2014 & conn. matters

page 3 of 6

70

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Advocate
for University of Delhi.
Mr. Anurag Mathur, Advocate for
respondent No.2.

+ W.P.(C) 3687/2016

NARENDER KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Rekha Rustagi, Advocate.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Advocate
for University of Delhi.
Mr. Anil Panwar, Advocate with Mr.
Ram Kumar Jha, Advocate for
respondent No.4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA

ORDER

%

10.11.2016

1. Learned counsel appearing for Delhi University states that petitioners are entitled to benefit of the General Provident Fund (GPF) scheme instead of the Contributory Provident Fund (CPF) scheme provided petitioners factually satisfy the requirements of the GPF scheme. Learned counsel for the Delhi University admits that the legal issue is covered in favour of the petitioners by the Division Bench judgment of this Court

passed in a bunch of cases with lead case being *Smt. Shashi Kiran and Ors. Vs. Union of India and Ors.* in LPA No.410/2014 decided on 24.8.2016.

2. Accordingly, these writ petitions are disposed of by directing the petitioners to make representations as to how the petitioners satisfy the eligibility criteria and the conditions for being covered by the GPF scheme, and which representations be made to the University of Delhi/employer within a period of four weeks from today. The University of Delhi within a period of six weeks thereafter will consider the representations and pass a speaking order giving the benefits to the petitioners of the GPF scheme on the petitioners being held entitled to the GPF scheme on complying with its requirements. The petitioners who will be entitled to the GPF benefits, as per the University of Delhi, the said benefits be released to the petitioners within a period of four weeks of the passing of the order. If according to the University of Delhi, a particular petitioner is not entitled to GPF benefits because of non-compliance of certain requirements of the GPF scheme, the University of Delhi will pass a speaking order and communicate the same to such petitioner giving the reasons as to how and why such petitioner has failed to comply with the requirement(s) of the GPF scheme for not being

granted the GPF benefits. In such a case any dis-satisfied petitioner or any of the other petitioners who feel that complete benefits have not been given to such petitioners, then, in these circumstances, such petitioners are at liberty to file appropriate independent proceedings for seeking enforcement of their rights in accordance with law.

3. The writ petitions are accordingly disposed of with the aforesaid observations.

4. Dasti to counsels for the parties.


VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J

NOVEMBER 10, 2016

Ne