

\$~5 and 6.

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 8694/2016
NEELAM ARORA Petitioner
Through: Mr. Surendra Kumar Arora, SPA.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS Respondents
Through: Ms. Barkha Babbar, Advocate with
Ms. Dipanjali Tyagi, Advocate.

+ W.P.(C) 8697/2016
NEELAM ARORA Petitioner
Through: Mr. Surendra Kumar Arora, SPA.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS Respondents
Through: Dr. Ashwani Bhardwaj, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

% **ORDER**
23.05.2018

1. W.P.(C) 8694/2016 has been filed by the petitioner for quashing an order dated 17.09.2015 passed by the Tribunal in an Original Application filed by her (O.A. No.3865/2014) to the extent that payment of interest on her pensionary benefits has been declined. Additionally, the petitioner seeks quashing of the order dated 31.05.2016, passed by the Tribunal in R.A. No.275/2015 filed by her for seeking review of the order dated 17.09.2015.

W.P.(C) 8694/2016 and connected matter

Page 1 of 3

2. Besides filing W.P.(C) 8694/2016, the petitioner has also filed W.P.(C) 8697/2016, for quashing an order dated 13.07.2016, passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal in Contempt Petition No.776/2015, whereby the contempt petition has been closed with the observation that the respondents have made substantial compliances of the orders passed by the Tribunal and it is the petitioner herself, who had failed to act by furnishing the requisite information as mentioned in the letter dated 02.02.2016, issued by the respondents and that the said information as sought by the respondents was not unreasonable.

3. After addressing arguments for some time, Mr. S.K. Arora, Power of Attorney holder of the petitioner, who also happens to be her husband, draws our attention to the order dated 13.01.2016, passed by the respondents directing the petitioner to furnish one surety of a serving Central Government Employee, who shall undertake to make good to the Government, all the emoluments paid to the petitioner on account of her pensionary/terminal benefits, as may be affected by any orders under Rule 9(1) of CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972 that may ensue in consequence of the judgment in the Trial Court in all cases filed against her.

4. Vide letter dated 02.02.2016, the petitioner was informed by the respondents that she had furnished the surety of Shri Narendra Kumar Arora (her brother in law), which was not in order. The requisite details required to be furnished by the surety were spelt out in the said letter.

5. Mr. Arora submits that by now his brother, Shri Narendra Kumar Arora, who had offered to be a surety for the petitioner, has retired from government service and he may be granted four weeks' time to identify

another surety, who is a government servant and is willing to abide by the requirements of the letter dated 02.02.2016.

6. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to submit a fresh surety of a government servant to the respondents within four weeks. Compliances shall be made of the other stipulations in the letter dated 02.02.2016.

7. The respondents shall be entitled to verify the status of the surety and if he satisfies all the requirements stated in the letter dated 02.02.2016, then all the emoluments payable to the petitioner on account of her pensionary/terminal benefits shall be released to her in terms of the speaking order dated 13.01.2016, within four weeks from the date the surety submits the relevant documents.

8. The petitions are disposed of

HIMA KOHLI, J

PRATIBHA RANI, J

MAY 23, 2018

na/rkb