

\$~VC-3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P. (C) 5264/2020
RAJ KUMAR & ORS.Petitioners
Through: Mr. Ravi Rai, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.Respondents
Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj & Mr.
Ripudaman Bhardwaj, CGSCs for
UOI with Mr. Piyush Gaur, G.P.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ASHA MENON

ORDER

% **14.08.2020**

[VIA VIDEO CONFERENCING]

1. The 22 petitioners, of the respondents Central Industrial Security Force (CISF), claiming to be similarly placed as the petitioners in *Vinoj V.V. Vs. Union of India* 2018 SCC OnLine Del 12714, are aggrieved from the denial of the benefit granted vide the said judgment, in spite of representations.

2. Several such petitions have been coming up before this Court in the recent past and we have at least on one occasion [being judgment dated 29th July, 2020 in W.P. (C) 4679/2020 titled *Vijesh Kumar M Vs. Union of India*] also requested the Additional Solicitor General (ASG), who in that matter had appeared for Union of India/CISF, to make sure that relief granted in judgments of general application is granted to all those entitled thereto, without compelling them to approach the Court. However the

same appears to have had no effect. We once again impress upon the respondents CISF to forthwith stop rejecting representations of others claiming to be similarly placed as the petitioners in *Vinoj V.V. supra*, for the relief as granted in *Vinoj V.V. supra*, merely by stating that the judgment in *Vinoj V.V. supra* is ‘*in personam*’ and not ‘*in rem*’ and if the representationists are in fact similarly placed as the petitioners in *Vinoj V.V. supra*, to grant such relief to them and if they are not similarly placed as the petitioners in *Vinoj V.V. supra*, to communicate the reasons therefor in writing.

3. We thus do not deem it appropriate to keep this petition pending and dispose of the same with a direction to the respondent CISF to, within six weeks hereof, consider the claim of each of the petitioners and if the petitioners or any of them are found entitled to the same benefit as granted in *Vinoj V.V. supra*, to grant the said benefit within the said time; if the petitioners or any of the petitioners are not found entitled to the benefit, the reasons therefor in writing be also communicated within six weeks hereof.

4. The petition is disposed of.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J.

ASHA MENON, J.

AUGUST 14, 2020

ck