

\$~26 to 31

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

+ **W.P.(C) 11397/2021 & C.M.No.35115/2021**

DARSHAN LAL

..... Petitioner

Through **Mr.Mukul Katyal, Advocate.**

versus

CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE

..... Respondent

Through **Mr.Vikrant N.Goyal, Advocate with
Mr.Prakeeh, Sub Inspector.**

+ **W.P.(C) 11416/2021 & C.M.No.35142/2021**

S.K. MOTIUR RAHMAN

..... Petitioner

Through **Mr.Mukul Katyal, Advocate.**

versus

CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE

..... Respondent

Through **Mr.Praveen Jain with Mr.Anshuman
Singh, Advocates with Mr.Prakeeh,
Sub Inspector.**

+ **W.P.(C) 11427/2021 & C.M.No.35166/2021**

VINOD KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through **Mr.Mukul Katyal, Advocate.**

versus

CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE

..... Respondent

Through **Mr.Harish Vaidhyanathan Shankar,
CGSC with Mr.Himanshu Pathak,
Ms.Bushra Kazim and Mr.Rahul
Mourya, Advocates with Mr.Prakeeh,
Sub Inspector.**

+ **W.P.(C) 11428/2021 & C.M.No.35167/2021**

RAMDHAN PANCHAL

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Mukul Katyal, Advocate.

versus

CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE

..... Respondent

Through Mr.Nirvikar Verma, Advocate with
Mr.Prakeeh, Sub Inspector.

+ **W.P.(C) 11429/2021 & C.M.No.35168/2021**

SURENDER KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Mukul Katyal, Advocate.

versus

CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE

..... Respondent

Through Mr.Anil Kaushik, CGSC with
Mr.Prakeeh, Sub Inspector.

+ **W.P.(C) 11430/2021 & C.M.No.35169/2021**

RAMAYAN RAM JAISWARA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Mukul Katyal, Advocate.

versus

CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE

..... Respondent

Through Mr.Naginder Benipal, Sr.Panel Counsel
for UOI with Ms.Rupali Kapoor and
Ms.Harithi Kambiri, Advocates with
Mr.Prakeeh, Sub Inspector.

%

Date of Decision: 07th October, 2021

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

MANMOHAN, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petitions, the Petitioners seek directions to the Respondent to consider the present petitions as representations made by the Petitioners along with the letters addressed by them to the Respondents and to re-fix the basic pay of the Petitioners along with the arrears due to them.
2. Learned Counsel for the Petitioners states that the Petitioners had written letters to the Principal, Central Training College, CRPF Gwalior (M.P.), stating that the basic pay of the Petitioners were less than their contemporaries and juniors in the force and that they wanted their basic pay to be corrected.
3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioners states that though the basic pay of the petitioners at the time of Fifth Pay Commission was Rs. 3125/-, yet the Petitioners were being paid Rs.75/- less increment under the Fifth Pay Commission since 10th October, 1997 which was effective from 01st January, 1996.
4. Learned Counsel for the Petitioners states that the basic pay of the petitioners should be revised from 1st January, 1996, along with the arrears, taking into account the office order issued in March 2016 pursuant to the order passed by the High Court of Madras, which had directed that pay in respect of HC/GD K Khader Basa with amendment from 01.01.1996 has to be paid to him retrospectively.
5. Learned Counsel for the Petitioners states that Petitioners are similarly placed as K. Khader Basa, who was eligible for re-fixation of basic pay from 10th October, 1997 and had been paid arrears of basic pay

retrospectively from January, 1996, making the Petitioners in the present case eligible for revision of their basic pay from 01st January, 1996 along with arrears.

6. Issue notice.

7. Learned counsel for the Respondents accepts notice. Mr.Prakeeh, Sub-Inspector, who is personally present in Court states that the Respondents have no objection to consider the present batch of writ petitions as representations and decide the same in accordance with law.

8. In rejoinder, learned counsel for the Petitioners states that in one of the matters being W.P.(C) No.11416/2021 titled *S.K.Motiur Rahman vs. Central Reserve Police Force*, the representation of the petitioners has already been rejected vide letter dated 23rd April, 2020.

9. In view of the statement made by Mr.Prakeeh, Sub-Inspector, this Court sets aside the letter dated 23rd April, 2020 and directs the competent authority to decide the representations of the Petitioners by way of a reasoned order in accordance with law within twelve weeks. This Court clarifies that it has not commented on the merit of the controversy. The rights and contentions of all the parties are left open.

10. In view of the aforesaid, the present batch of writ petitions along with pending applications stand disposed of.

MANMOHAN, J

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

OCTOBER 07, 2021
KA