

\$~Suppl.-50 to 65

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

50

+ W.P. (C) 8208/2020

SI/MIN M.R. GURJAR AND ORSPetitioners

Through: Mr. Nikhil Palli, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, CGSC.

WITH

51

+ W.P. (C) 9252/2020

SHABAD PRAKAASH PUNIA AND ORSPetitioners

Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, CGSC for UOI.

WITH

52

+ W.P. (C) 9311/2020

JASVIR SINGH, No.04254893 & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Nikhil Palli, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: None.

WITH

53

+ W.P. (C) 5075/2020

SUDESH KUMAR SINGH AND ORSPetitioners

Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Manish Mohan, CGSC with
Mr. Manisha Saroha and
Mr. Sameer Sinha, Advocates.

WITH

54

+ W.P. (C) 5080/2020

SUJAN SINGH YADAV & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Ms. Ankita Patnaik, Advocate.

Versus

UOI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC with
Mr. Siddharth Singh, Advocate.

WITH

55

+ W.P. (C) 5443/2020

PRASIDDH NARAIN AND ORS.Petitioners

Through: Ms. Ankita Patnaik, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr.Nirvikar Verma and
Mr.Shomendu Ghosh, Advocates for
R/UOI.

WITH

56

+ W.P. (C) 5444/2020

PRAVEEN KUMAR AND ORSPetitioners

Through: Ms. Ankita Patnaik, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Jaswinder Singh, Advocate.

WITH

57

+ W.P. (C) 5445/2020

KULESH KUMAR PATEL AND ORSPetitioners
Through: Ms. Ankita Patnaik, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Tanveer Ahmed Ansari,
Advocate.

WITH

58

+ W.P. (C) 5447/2020

GAIKWAD VALMIK S AND ORSPetitioners
Through: Ms. Ankita Patnaik, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERSRespondents
Through: Mr. Pardeep Kumar Sharma,
Advocate.

WITH

59

+ W.P. (C) 11097/2019

AMAR KUMARPetitioner
Through: Mr. Anil Kumar Sahu, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Ajay Digpaul , CGSC with
Mr. Kamal R Digpaul, Advocate.

WITH

60

+ W.P. (C) 12083/2019

KARAMVIR SINGH & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Anil Kumar Sahu, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. G Tushar Rao, Advocate for UOI.
Mr. Manu Chaturvedi, GP with
Mr. Arjun Rekhi, Advocate.

WITH

61

+ W.P. (C) 7745/2020

HARBIR SINGH AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sushil Kumar Pandey, Sr. Panel
Counsel with
Mr. Rahul Mourya, Advocate.

WITH

62

+ W.P. (C) 10317/2020, CM APPL.32656/2020

DILIP KUMAR SINGH AND OTHERS

.....Petitioners

Through:

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vinod Diwakar, CGSC with
Mr. Himanshu Pathak, Advocate.

WITH

63

+ W.P. (C) 11061/2020

SH BUDHI SINGH AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Ankita Patnaik, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Farman Ali with Mr. Athar Raza
Farooquei, Advocates for R-1.

WITH

64

+ W.P. (C) 11063/2020

BIJENDRA SINGH AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Ankita Patnaik, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Sarika Singh Sr Panel Counsel
with Mr. Abhishek Khanna,
Advocate.

AND

65

+ W.P. (C) 11065/2020

BHUPENDRA SINGH AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Ankita Patnaik, Advocate.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Avnish Singh and
Ms. Manpreet Kaur, Advocates.

%

Date of Decision: 15th January, 2021

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ASHA MENON

J U D G M E N T

MANMOHAN, J (Oral):

1. These Petitions have been filed by Petitioners who are Personnel Below Officer Rank (PBOR) in the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF),

Border Security Force (BSF), Sashastra Seema Bal (SSB) and Indo-Tibetan Border Police (ITBP). All the petitioners applied pursuant to the notification dated September 2003 and June 2003 for the post of Constable/GD in Central Armed Police Forces and Sub-Inspectors through Staff Selection Commission and qualified in the said examination of 2003. On the basis of the advertisement, the Old Pension Scheme under the CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972 was applicable. The New Contributory Pension Scheme was introduced by a notification dated 22nd December, 2003 and implemented with effect from 1st January, 2004.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners state that by a notification dated 22nd December 2003, it was stipulated that the new scheme would not be applicable to Armed Forces and that they would be governed by the Old Pension Scheme. They point out that the Ministry of Home Affairs ('MHA') by a communication dated 6th August, 2004, has clarified that the CRPF and ITBP is an Armed Force of the Union of India under the administrative control of the MHA and that even the Section 3(i) of the CRPF Act and Section 4 (i) of the ITBP Act clearly provides that there shall continue to be an Armed Force maintained by the Central Government and called the 'CRPF', 'BSF', 'SSB' and 'ITBP'.

3. They submit that even Article 246 read with List I Entry II of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution of India clearly envisages Armed Forces of Union of India and includes Naval, Military and Air Force, any other Armed Force of the Union. They further submit that the Apex Court in the case of *Akhilesh Prasad v Union Territory of Mizoram; 1981 (2) SCC 150*, has categorically held that the sub-section itself declares in no uncertain terms that CRPF is an Armed Force of the Central Government

which is the same thing as saying that it is a part of the Armed Force of the Union and that being the position, even as per the notification dated 22nd December, 2003, the scheme of New Pension Scheme has been excluded from the Armed Forces of the Union.

4. They also contend that batchmates of most of the petitioners have been given benefit of Old Pension Scheme under various judgements passed by this Court in *Patil Gopal Babulal & Ors. vs. Union of India & Ors.*, *W.P.(C) 11646/2018*; *Tanaka Ram & Ors. vs. Union of India & Ors.*, 2019 (174) DRJ 146 (DB); *Shyam Kumar Choudhary and Ors. vs. Union of India* being *W.P.(C) No.1358 of 2017* and *Niraj Kumar Singh & Ors. vs. Union of India & Ors.*, *W.P.(C) No.13129/2019*.

5. Pursuant to the notice issued in the present petitions, the Respondents despite having been given adequate time, have not filed reply in most of the matters till date. On behalf of the Respondents, further time has been sought for the purpose of filing Counter Affidavit. It is urged that because of the large number of petitioners, their factual details could not be verified and a last opportunity be given to them. Learned counsel for the respondents submit that without their counter-affidavits being on record, they will be handicapped in approaching the Supreme Court because they will not be able to give the mandatory undertaking that the facts stated therein were part of records before this Court.

6. However, in the counter affidavit filed in *W.P.(C) 12083/2019* it is stated that admittedly since the entire recruitment process was initiated in the year 2004 and the appointment letters were issued between the months of June – July 2004, the New Pension Scheme would be applicable and the petitioners would therefore not be entitled to the Old Pension Scheme. It is

further urged on behalf of Respondents that in W.P.(C) No. 5075/2020, the chart mentioned in the petition shows that the Written Examinations were itself held on different dates of January 2004 and therefore, the Petitioners cannot legally exercise lien over a post from the date of advertisement i.e. from a date even prior to the Written Examination.

7. Learned counsel for respondents submit that none of the earlier judgements including *Patil Gopal Babulal & Ors. vs. Union of India & Ors.*, W.P.(C) 11646/2018 and *Tanaka Ram & Ors. vs. Union of India & Ors.*, 2019 (174) DRJ 146 (DB) are applicable to the present case inasmuch as in those cases the recruitment process had started in the year 2003 and some of the incumbents had been issued appointment letters in the year 2003 itself before the New Pension Scheme was made effective from 01st January, 2004. Therefore, according to them, on facts, the present batch of matters is different and the petitioners in the present case are not entitled to any relief as prayed for.

8. The issue in the present batch of matters is no longer *res integra*. Consequently, the request for additional time to file counter-affidavit is declined.

9. In the case of certain constables of the BSF, this Court by its judgment dated 12th February, 2019 in *Tanaka Ram* (supra) allowed the prayer of those Petitioners and permitted them to avail of the benefit of the Old Pension Scheme. It was held that the option to continue the Old Pension Scheme should be extended to all those who had been selected in the examination conducted in 2003, but were issued call letters only in January or February, 2004. It is also pertinent to mention that the Respondents aggrieved by the said judgment filed an SLP bearing No. 25228/2019 before

the Apex Court. The said SLP has been dismissed by the Supreme Court vide order dated 02nd September, 2019.

10. This Court in *Shyam Kumar Choudhary and Ors. vs. Union of India* being *W.P.(C) No.1358 of 2017* allowed similar petitions vide judgment dated 09th April, 2019 against which the Respondents had again filed SLP bearing no. 31539/2019 which was again dismissed on 27th September, 2019. The Respondents thereafter chose to file a review petition bearing no.2188/2020 before the Apex Court in the said matter and the said Review petition was also dismissed on merits vide order dated 24th November, 2020.

11. Following the judgment of *Shyam Kumar Choudhary* (supra), the learned predecessor Division Bench in *Niraj Kumar Singh & Ors. vs. Union of India & Ors., W.P.(C) No.13129/2019* granted similar benefit to 17 petitioners who had applied to the post of Sub-Inspector in Central Police Organisations pursuant to an advertisement dated 21st June, 2003 even when the written examination and physical efficiency test were held in November, 2003, medical examination was held in January-February, 2004 and final result was declared in May, 2004. The said 17 petitioners were issued offer of appointment on 02nd June, 2005 and on accepting the same, the appointment letter was issued on 14th July, 2005 for joining the Sashastra Seema Bal.

12. Another Coordinate Bench vide judgment dated 06th November, 2020 in *W.P.(C) No. 6548 of 2020* as well 6989/2020 was pleased to allow the said petitions for grant of Old Pension Scheme by following the judgment in *Shyam Kumar Choudhary* (supra).

13. Having regard to the fact that in the present batch of cases also the advertisement/notification was issued in September, 2003 and June, 2003

i.e. prior to coming into force of the present contributory pension scheme on 22nd December, 2003, this Court is of the view that petitioners cannot be deprived of the benefit of the Old Pension Scheme.

14. This is more so when the batchmates of the petitioners are getting this benefit under various judgements passed by this Court.

15. For the above reasons, the petitions are allowed. Respondents are directed to extend the benefit of Old Pension Scheme to each of these Petitioners and pass consequential orders within a period of eight weeks from today.

16. Accordingly, the writ petitions along with pending applications stand disposed of.

17. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith. Copy of the order be also forwarded to the learned counsel through e-mail.

MANMOHAN, J

ASHA MENON, J

JANUARY 15, 2021
KA