



\$~8

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8905/2024**

**RAMESH KUMAR SEHGAL**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Tripurani Ray, Mr. Varun Thakur  
& Mr. Anirudh Ray, Advs.

versus

**UNION OF INDIA & ANR.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Bhagwan Swarup Shukla, CGSC  
with Mr. Yash Baroliya, Adv. for R-  
1/UOI.  
Mr. Jasbir Bidhuri, Adv. for R-2/  
Bank.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN**

**ORDER**

**06.11.2025**

%

1. This writ petition is filed seeking directions to respondent no.2 – Bank to pay the employer's contribution to the provident fund. Further prayer is for payment of full pension along with interest from the date of compulsory retirement.
2. The brief facts are that the petitioner served with respondent no.2 – Bank with effect from 07.08.1978. On 10.10.2006, the petitioner was suspended during the pendency of the departmental proceedings. While working as a manager at Delhi, the petitioner was charge-sheeted on 07.05.2007. The departmental proceedings culminated in order dated 26.05.2008 compulsorily retiring the petitioner and this issue is sub judice before this Court in a writ petition. The petitioner approached this Court



seeking directions for release of the retiral benefits. The writ petition was disposed of on 26.09.2012 directing the Bank to release the retiral benefits within four weeks.

3. The pin pointed controversy now in the present petition is with regard to employer's contribution towards the provident fund and non-payment of full pension along with interest.

4. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and perusing the pleadings, it is revealed that these two issues have not been raised before the respondents and dealt with.

5. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, the writ petition is disposed of with the directions that let the petitioner file a detailed representation before the respondent no.2 – Bank within four weeks from today and the respondent no.2 shall consider it in accordance with law and pass a speaking order, after providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

6. Needless to say the petitioner shall be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law if aggrieved of the decision.

7. The matter pertains to the post-retiral benefits, it shall be appreciated that the needful is done by respondent no.2 expeditiously not later than three months from the receipt of the representation.

**AVNEESH JHINGAN, J**

**NOVEMBER 6, 2025/ ha**