

\$~48

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **W.P.(C) 6733/2016**

PROFESSOR M. OBAID SIDDIQUI ..... Petitioner  
Through: Mr.M.Atyab Siddiqui, Mr.Adnan  
Siddiqui, Ms.Tibah Siddiqui, Mr.Obaid Siddiqui,  
Advs.

versus

VICE CHANCELLOR, JAMIA MILLIA ISLAMIA & ANR  
..... Respondents  
Through: Dr.Amit George, Ms.Zeba Khair, Advs.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO**

**ORDER**  
% **03.08.2016**

This is a petition filed by the petitioner with the following  
reliefs:-

*“(a) Quashing the Order issued by the Vice Chancellor  
(Respondent No. 1) incorporated in Copy letter bearing No. F.  
No. 4-137/RO/ (Estt.)/2016 dated 17.5.2016;*

*(b) Direct the Competent Authority to suitably enhance  
the subsistence (suspension) allowances in accordance with the  
rules and the mandate of law;”*

The impugned order dated 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 reads as under:

*“Consequent upon extension of suspension of Mr.M.  
Obaid Siddiqui, Professor (under suspension), AJK MCRC,  
beyond three months, vide office order dated 29-4-2016, the*

*subsistence allowance payable to him has been reviewed by the Vice Chancellor as per provisions contained in the CCS (CCA) Rules. The Vice Chancellor has ordered that 'considering the serious nature of the charges imputed against the Charged Officer and the continuing regular enquiry and his frequent visit to the AJK MCRC premises as reported, it is appropriate not to vary the quantum of subsistence allowance being paid to him and it remains unchanged'.*

*Therefore, the subsistence payable to Mr. M. Obaid Siddiqui, beyond three months will continue to remain unchanged i.e. an amount equal to his half pay with admissible allowance(s) under PR 53. The payment of subsistence allowance is subject to submission of non-employment certificate on prescribed form (copy enclosed) every month by Mr. M. Obaid Siddiqui to the Accounts Officer (Salaries), JMI as required under PR 53 (2)."*

Dr. Amit George, learned counsel appearing for the respondents on advance notice states that the impugned order dated 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 was passed in view of the circumstances existed on that date. According to him in view of the order passed by this Court in WP(C) no.5974/2016, wherein this Court had allowed the petitioner to visit the campus for medical treatment/operating the bank account only, the circumstances have changed and the respondents intends to review the issue of subsistence allowance payable to the petitioner. If that be so, the respondents shall consider the writ petition as a representation and pass an order in accordance with the rules on or before 31<sup>st</sup> August, 2016.

The petition is disposed of.

**V. KAMESWAR RAO, J**

**AUGUST 03, 2016**  
**RN**