

\$~33

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

+ W.P.(C) 809/2020

AYYAPPAN SHAWAL KUMAR Petitioner
Through Mr.P.A.Noor Mohamed and
Ms.Giffara S., Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents
Through Mr.Manish Mohan, CGSC and
Ms.Manisha Saroha, Adv. for UOI.
Mr.Prateek Dahiya, Adv.for R-5

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

ORDER
% **24.01.2020**

C.M.Nos.2518-19/2020 (Exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 809/2020 & CM No.2517/2020

This petition challenges the order dated 14.01.2020 passed by the respondent no.4, rejecting the application of the petitioner for granting extension to retain the government accommodation occupied by him upon attaining the age of superannuation.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the representation of the petitioner has not been considered by the Appropriate Authority nor have the reasons given by the petitioner for seeking extension, discussed in the Impugned Order.

I do not find any merit in the above submission. The Impugned Order

clearly shows that under the New General Pool Residential Accommodation Rules, only six months retention is allowed on retirement on normal licence fee and beyond this period no retention is to be allowed “under any circumstances”.

I, therefore find no infirmity in the said order.

At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioner requests that the petitioner be granted time till the end of February, 2020 to vacate the premises. Without prejudice to the rights of the respondents, the petitioner may be allowed to retain the flat in question till 29.02.2020.

As far as the claim of damages for the period of occupation is concerned, this Court has not expressed any opinion on the validity of the said demand.

The petition is dismissed with the above directions.

Dasti.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

JANUARY 24, 2020/Arya