

\$~9

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5573/2013**

SEEMA JARIWALA

..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

THE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & OTHERS

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Isha Khanna, Adv. for Ms. Nidhi
Raman, Adv. for R-1 to 3.
Mr. Mohank Bhadana, Adv. for R-5
to 7.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA

ORDER

% **02.02.2017**

1. Learned counsel for respondent nos.5 to 7 does not dispute the entitlement of the petitioner to be paid monetary benefits equal to that payable to a similarly placed employee such as the petitioner in the government school or government aided school, except that it is stated that the entitlement of the petitioner in terms of the law of limitation would be only for three years prior to filing of the writ petition in view of the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of *State of Orissa and Another Vs. Mamta Mohanty (2011) 3 SCC 436*.

2. Learned counsel for respondent nos. 5 to 7 draws the attention of this Court to running page 123 which shows that from 1.7.2010 onwards

petitioner has been paid her monetary emoluments as payable to a similarly placed employee in a government school or government aided school.

3. In view of the above facts taking the running page 123 to be correct which is the Supplementary Salary Arrear Bill from 1.7.2010, and directing the respondent nos. 5 to 7 and more particularly the respondent no.7-school that petitioner should be paid in accordance with law the monetary emoluments not lesser than payable to similarly placed employee/teacher of a government school or government aided school, this writ petition is allowed and disposed of by observing that petitioner, in view of page 123 is being paid the appropriate monetary benefits from 1.7.2010.

4. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of in terms of the aforesaid observations.

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J

FEBRUARY 02, 2017

ib