



\$~34

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9154/2021 & CM APPL. 28504/2021**

SANTHANAM IYANGAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nalin Tripathi & Mr. Nischal
Tripathi, Advs.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber & Mr. Nikunj
Arora, Advs. for R1.

Mr. Anurag Dayal Mathur, Adv. for
R2.

Ms. Latika Choudhary, Adv. for R3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

ORDER

%

04.11.2025

1. This petition was filed seeking directions to the respondents to release the pension, arrears and the terminal benefits along with interest. There is also a prayer for directing the respondents to notionally promote the petitioner from 2010 and a grievance against the recovery in consequence to the two increments wrongly given as per the respondents.
2. Learned counsel for the parties are at *ad idem* that during the pendency of the petition substantial compliance is there with regard to payment of pension, arrears and other benefits.
3. The surviving dispute is with regard to the interest on delayed payment and a recovery of Rs.3,66,000/- approximately consequent to wrong grant of two increments, as per the respondents.
4. The petitioner has received the pension and the retiring benefits.
5. As on date there is no order passed by respondent no.2/college for



recovery of Rs.3,66,000/- approximately.

6. Learned counsel for respondent no.1/university states that the university has already passed an order directing respondent no.2/college for release of the pension after deducting the amount. It would be appropriate to note that this order was not communicated to the petitioner thereby denying the opportunity to the petitioner to assail the order. Let the order be supplied to the petitioner within three weeks from today.

7. Without influenced by order passed by respondent no.1/university, respondent no.2/college after providing opportunity of hearing to the petitioner shall pass a reasoned order on an issue as to whether the amount paid as a result of alleged wrong grant of increment can be recovered at this stage.

8. Let the petitioner approach the respondents claiming the interest on the delayed payment of retiring benefits and the respondents shall consider the same in accordance with law by passing a speaking order as expeditiously as possible.

9. The petitioner shall file a representation claiming notional promotion from 2010. In the eventuality of representation being made, the same shall be considered in accordance with law by the respondent no.2/college expeditiously.

10. The petitioner shall be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law if aggrieved of the decisions.

11. The writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J

NOVEMBER 4, 2025/Ch