

\$~21

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

+ W.P.(C) 1125/2016

V PANDURANG

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr.Vijay Kumar, Advocate
with Mr.Rahul Kr.Singh,
Advocate

versus

UOI AND ORS

..... Respondents

Represented by: Mr.Sarat Chandra, Advocate
with Mr.Sachin Chandra,
Advocate for R-1 to 3

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP NANDRAJOG

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

% **25.07.2016**

1. As drafted there is utter confusion in the writ petition for the reason there are averments made to the clarificatory anomalies arising out of the fact that post January 01, 2006 all persons being paid salary from the Consolidated Fund of India started receiving the benefit of increment with effect from January 01, 2006; but with a problem. Those who were recruited in the year 2005 had not completed one year's service and therefore clarifications were issued as to in what manner for these persons benefit of increment had to be given.

2. An independent problem arose when the CCS (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008 were implemented. The post 2006 direct recruits started receiving a

W.P.(C) 1125/2016

page 1 of 2

higher salary than their seniors who came up by promotion. The reasons was the formula provided giving a multiplier of 1.86 with reference to the last pay drawn.

3. It was removed by a Court decision which has been accepted and implemented by the various departments.

4. The instant writ petition is inchoate with averments concerning the first problem with which we highlighted and the second, overlooking that the two are distinct.

5. It appears that the problem of the petitioner emanates from the CCS (Revised Pay) Rules of 2008.

6. In the absence of actionable pleadings counsel for the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the writ petition with right reserved to file a fresh petition on the same cause.

7. Granting liberty as prayed for the instant writ petition is dismissed as not pressed.

8. No costs.

PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

JULY 25, 2016
'skb'