

\$~13 to 16.

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6695/2015**

**VIJAY LAKSHMI SINHA** ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Indrani Ghosh, Advocate with  
Ms. Nidhi Jacob, Advocate

versus

**DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION & ANR** ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi, Advocate  
for R-1 with Mr. Pradeep Kaushik, LA, Zone 27,  
DDE.

Mr. Saket Sikri, Advocate with Ms. Adwaita  
Sharma, Advocate for R-2/School.

+ **W.P.(C) 6698/2015**

**SHAHIDA JAVED** ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Indrani Ghosh, Advocate with  
Ms. Nidhi Jacob, Advocate

versus

**DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION & ANR.** ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi, Advocate  
for R-1 with Mr. Pradeep Kaushik, LA, Zone 27,  
DDE.

Mr. Saket Sikri, Advocate with Ms. Adwaita  
Sharma, Advocate for R-2/School.

+ **W.P.(C) 6723/2015**

**SHAHIDA PERWIN ZAMAN** ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Indrani Ghosh, Advocate with  
Ms. Nidhi Jacob, Advocate

versus

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION & ANR ..... Respondents  
Through: Mr. Satyakam, ASC for R-1 with  
Mr. Pradeep Kaushik, LA, Zone 27, DDE.  
Mr. Saket Sikri, Advocate with Ms. Adwaita  
Sharma, Advocate for R-2/School.

+ W.P.(C) 7916/2015 ..... Petitioner  
AYESHA NAQVI  
Through: Ms. Indrani Ghosh, Advocate with  
Ms. Nidhi Jacob, Advocate

versus

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION & ANR ..... Respondents  
Through: Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi, Advocate  
for R-1 with Mr. Pradeep Kaushik, LA, Zone 27,  
DDE.  
Mr. Saket Sikri, Advocate with Ms. Adwaita  
Sharma, Advocate for R-2/School.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI**

**ORDER**  
% **23.05.2016**

1. With the consent of the parties, the present petitions are being disposed of on the similar lines as passed on 29.1.2015 in a set of writ petitions, lead matter being **W.P.(C) 7684/2013** entitled Kausar Perwin vs. Director of Education and Ors.
2. The petitioners herein, who were employed as Teachers with the respondent No.2/School, have filed the present petitions praying *inter alia* for directions to the respondent No.2/School to pay them their dues under Section 10(1) of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973, as detailed in para

13 of the writ petitions.

3. Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are entitled to the benefits as per the Recommendations made by the Sixth Central Pay Commission, as also under the order dated 29.05.1991, issued by the respondent No.1/DOE.

4. Counsel for the respondent No.2/School submits that the petitioners would be entitled to the benefits as per the Recommendations of the Sixth Central Pay Commission, as per their respective entitlement, but he disputes their claim for bonus etc. based on the letter dated 29.05.1991 addressed by the respondent No.1/DOE to the respondent No.2/School.

5. Counsel for the petitioners submits that in the order dated 29.01.2015 passed in the captioned batch of petitions, liberty was granted to the petitioners therein to seek any other monetary emoluments as per extant rules/circulars/guidelines etc. and it is in the light of the said order that the petitioners are claiming bonus and other benefits from the respondent No.2, as detailed in para 19 of the letter dated 29.05.1991, issued by the respondent No.1/DOE.

6. Without making any observations with regard to the entitlement of the petitioners to the benefits claimed on the basis of the letter dated 29.05.1991 addressed by the respondent No.1/DOE to the respondent No.2/School, with the consent of the parties, the present petitions are disposed of with directions issued to the respondent No.2/School to release all the benefits to which each of the petitioners would be entitled as per the Recommendations made by the Sixth Central Pay Commission, within three months from today. If it is the respondent No.2's stand that the petitioners are not entitled to any of the benefits referred to in the letter dated 29.05.1991 addressed by

the respondent No.1/DOE to the School, then reasons therefor shall be furnished by the respondent No.2/School to the petitioners under written intimation to them, within eight weeks from today.

7. If the petitioners are aggrieved by the decision that may be taken by the respondent No.2/School, they shall be entitled to seek their remedies, if so advised, in accordance with law.

8. The petitions are disposed of.

**HIMA KOHLI, J**

**MAY 23, 2016**

rkb/mk