



\$~81

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

+ W.P.(C) 10525/2025

DR AK SINGLA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH
ITS SECRETARY & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vikrant N. Goyal, Ms.
Laavanya Kaushik & Ms. Khyati,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

23.07.2025

1. Issue notice. Mr. Vikrant N. Goyal, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.
2. The petitioner retired as Joint Director, Food Safety and Standards Authority of India ["FSSAI"] – respondent No. 2, on 31.01.2018. He assails an office memorandum dated 26.06.2025 ["impugned order"], by which respondent No. 1 – Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Union of India ["UOI"], has come to the conclusion that he is not eligible for obtaining the benefit of the Dynamic Assured Career Progression Scheme ["DACP Scheme"].
3. By the impugned order, UOI has withdrawn a letter dated 04.06.2019 issued to FSSAI. The letter dated 04.06.2019 clearly granted



the benefit of the order of this Court in *Dr. Chandra Shekhar Sahukar v. Union of India* [W.P.(C) 2870/2011, decided on 14.10.2014] to the petitioner herein also. Pursuant to this letter and further representations of the petitioner, FSSAI fixed the petitioner's pay on grant of DACP benefit, by an office order dated 14.12.2020.

4. Mr. Rajeev Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the effect of the impugned order is to undo the benefits granted to the petitioner, pursuant to an order of this Court, and implemented. He further submits that the impugned order has been passed without any notice or hearing to the petitioner.

5. The withdrawal of benefits expressly granted to the petitioner by the specific orders dated 04.06.2019 and 14.12.2020, as noted above, without notice or hearing to the petitioner, does not appear to me to be appropriate. The petitioner is bound to suffer adverse financial consequences as a result of the impugned order, and ought to have been put on notice.

6. At this stage, therefore, I am of the view that it would be appropriate for UOI and FSSAI to reconsider the issue after giving the petitioner an opportunity to make a representation. The present writ petition may be treated as a representation. The petitioner will also be called for a meeting to clarify the issue arising from his representation, whereafter the respondents may consider whether it is necessary, at this stage, to withdraw benefits that were granted to him more than six years ago.

7. The meeting will be held within one month from today, and the date, time, and venue of the meeting will be conveyed to the petitioner



through counsel.

8. The rights and contentions of the parties remain reserved.
9. The writ petition stands disposed of with these observations.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JULY 23, 2025
'pv/KA'/