

\$~4 to 6, 10 and 11

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

+ W.P.(C) 4214/2016 & C.M. No. 17800/2016

MAST RAM

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Advocate with
Mr. Bhanu Gupta, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with
Mr. Akhilesh Kumar, Advocate for R-1 to R-5

+ W.P.(C) 263/2017

MOHAN RAI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Advocate with
Mr. Bhanu Gupta, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Vikas Mahajan, CGSC with
Mr. Deepak Goyal, Advocate.

+ W.P.(C) 293/2017

HAR PHOOL SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Advocate with
Mr. Bhanu Gupta, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Vijay Joshi, Advocate.

- + W.P.(C) 5637/2018 & C.M. No. 22011/2018
SURAT SINGH Petitioner
Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Advocate with
Mr. Bhanu Gupta, Advocate.
versus
UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Mahender Kumar Bhardwaj,
Advocate with Ms. Vinita Kumari,
Advocate.
- + W.P.(C) 5639/2018 & C.M. No. 22012/2018
HARI SINGH Petitioner
Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Advocate with
Mr. Bhanu Gupta, Advocate.
versus
UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Mahender Kumar Bhardwaj,
Advocate with Ms. Vinita Kumari,
Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

% 24.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for the respondents states that pursuant to the order dated 23.3.2018, he has obtained instructions from the Department that the present case is covered by earlier decisions rendered by the High Court, including a recent judgment dated 22.2.2018, passed by the Division Bench (of which one of us, Hima Kohli, J. was a member) in **W.P.(C) No. 8306/2017** entitled Kanwal Singh vs. Union of India & Ors.
2. Learned counsels for the respondents state that as per his instructions,
W.P.(C) 4214/2016 & connected matters

the facts of present cases are covered by Kanwal Singh (supra) and the said judgment is under the consideration of the Department, for taking a final view in the matter.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners states that in the case of Kanwal Singh (supra), the Division Bench had relied on Ram Phal (supra), which has already been implemented in the year 2016.

4. In view of the fact that the issue raised in the present petition is no longer *res integra*, having already been decided in several decisions including the judgment dated 03.8.2016, rendered by the Division Bench of this Court in **W.P.(C) No. 3035/2016** entitled Ram Phal vs. Union of India & Ors. and Kanwal Singh (supra), the present petitions are allowed.

5. The PPOs impugned in each petition are accordingly quashed and set aside. The respondents are directed to issue a fresh PPO in each case by fixing the pension of the petitioners in terms of the fitment table for the post which they were holding at the time of their superannuation, payable with effect from 01.01.2006, along with the arrears of pension after re-fixation of their pension. In the event, the said process is not completed within three months from today, then the respondents shall be liable to pay the petitioners simple interest on the arrears of pension at the current PPF rate.

6. The petitions are allowed and disposed of with no orders as to costs.

HIMA KOHLI, J

PRATIBHA RANI, J

MAY 24, 2018/ap
W.P.(C) 4214/2016 & connected matters

page 3 of 3