



\$~109

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

+ W.P.(C) 17061/2024

MRS SUSHILA VEL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pranaynath Jha, Advocate

versus

AIRPORT AUTHORITY OF INDIA & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Digvijay Rai and Mr. Archit Mishra, Advocates with Mr. Yatinder Chowdhary, Law Officer for Respondent No. 1/AAI.

Mr. Devesh Khanagwal, Ms. Nippun Sharma and Ms. Anjana Gosain, Advocates for Respondent No.2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

%

10.12.2024

CM APPL. 72339/2024

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 17061/2024 and CM APPL. 72340/2024

3. This writ petition has been filed on behalf of the Petitioner aggrieved by the pay anomaly in her basic pay as also her *inter se* seniority with one Smt. Sulekha Sethi.
4. Broadly understood, case of the Petitioner is that she is senior to Ms. Sulekha Sethi who joined AAI as Junior Stenographer after her on 06.04.1994 and is therefore junior to her despite which she is being shown senior in the provisional seniority list published on 01.09.2024. The other grievance of the Petitioner is that *albeit* till 2007, Petitioner's Basic Pay was higher than that of Ms. Sulekha Sethi i.e. before pay revision but from 2008



onwards, Basic Pay of Ms. Sulekha Sethi has become higher and therefore, there is a serious pay anomaly.

5. Issue notice.

6. Mr. Digvijay Rai, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of Respondent No.1/AAI and submits that this writ petition is premature insofar as the *inter se* seniority dispute is concerned, since the seniority list dated 01.09.2024 is only a provisional seniority list and it is only after objections are invited and final seniority list is circulated that the cause of action, if any, may arise in favour of the Petitioner.

7. Mr. Devesh Khanagwal, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of Respondent No.2.

8. Having heard learned counsels for the parties, there is merit in the objection that at this stage, the writ petition is premature. As and when the final seniority list is issued and Petitioner has any grievance, she may take recourse to legal remedies available to her. Insofar as the alleged pay anomaly is concerned, learned counsel for the Petitioner candidly submits that the Basic Pay fixation also has a connection with the seniority position and therefore in this light, in my view, even on this aspect the writ petition is premature.

9. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of, without entering into the merits of the case and with liberty to the Petitioner to take recourse to legal remedies at the appropriate stage. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

10. Pending application also stands disposed of.

JYOTI SINGH, J

DECEMBER 10, 2024

B.S. Rohella/shivam