



\$~117

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 4410/2025**
UNION OF INDIA THROUGH REVENUE SECRETARY &
ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr.Vinay Yadav, SPC with
Mr.Ansh Kalra, Ms.Kamna
Beharni and Mr.Divyanshu
Sinha, Advs. for UOI

versus

BRIJENDRA SINGH VERMARespondent
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

ORDER

% **07.04.2025**

CM APPL. 20311/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4410/2025 & CM APPL. 20310/2025

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioners challenging the Order dated 18.04.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as, 'learned Tribunal') in O.A No. 570/2024 titled "***Brijendra Singh Verma (B.S. Verma) v. Union of India & Ors.***", disposing of the OA filed by the respondent herein, with the following directions:

"3. In view of what has been outlined above, the present OA is allowed with a direction to the respondents to consider the claim and representation of the applicant for grant of Grade Pay of Rs. 5400/- on completion of four



*years of service on the analogy of the judgment quoted verbatim above, which has further relied upon the judgment of **M. Subramaniam** (supra).*

4. These directions shall be complied with by the respondents within six weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order."

3. It is the case of the petitioners that the case of the respondent is not covered by the Judgment of the Madras High Court in W.P. (C) No. 13225/2010 dated 06.09.2010 titled **M. Subramaniam v. Union of India & Ors.**

4. We are of the opinion that as the direction in the Impugned Order is only to consider the case of the respondent in terms of the said Judgment, it is for the petitioners to first consider the same and to pass an appropriate order upon such consideration. The only issue decided by the learned Tribunal in the Impugned Order is that the Judgment of the Madras High Court in **M. Subramaniam** (supra) is one passed *in rem* and not *in personam*. There can be no cavil to the same.

5. Accordingly, we do not find any merit in the present petition as warranting interference with the Impugned Order at this stage.

6. The petition, alongwith the pending application, is accordingly dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

APRIL 7, 2025/sg/ik

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)