



\$~25

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

+ LPA 518/2025, CM APPL. 49781/2025, CM APPL. 49782/2025, CM APPL. 49783/2025

RAJDEEP SINGH & ORS. ....Appellants

Through: Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, Adv.

versus

LIONS PUBLIC SCHOOL & ORS. ....Respondents

Through: None.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIMAL KUMAR YADAV**

**ORDER**

%

**13.08.2025**

1. The present appeal is directed against the order dated 23.12.2024 passed by learned Single Judge in WP (C) No. 6542/2022, with the limited grievance that the learned Single Judge has omitted to grant the interest component on the arrears of the salary of the Appellants.
2. The Appellants had approached the learned Single Judge by filing the aforementioned writ petition seeking for a direction to revise the pay of the petitioners as per the pay matrix under 7<sup>th</sup> Central Pay Commission (CPC).
3. A bare perusal of the Impugned Judgment shows that the Respondent/School had accepted its liability to the revised pay as per the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC. However, they had sought permission for release of the amount in six equal installments. The learned Single Judge, after considering all the arguments, has directed the Respondent/School to pay the installments for



which purpose, the learned Single Judge relegated the parties to the concerned Deputy Director to be nominated by the Director of Education, who has been directed to complete the exercise within a period of six weeks.

4. The grievance in this appeal is only *qua* grant of interest for the delay in payment of the arrears of salary as per the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC. However, a perusal of the Impugned Judgment does not reveal that the Appellants had pressed for grant of interest on the arrears of salary and as the impugned judgment does not reflect that it was sought for during the hearing. Learned counsel for the Appellants states that any amount which is due, is liable to be paid along with interest and this fact has been ignored by the learned Single Judge.

5. Since this issue is not a pure question of law, but a question where the entire facts and circumstances have to be considered before granting the prayer, this Court gave a suggestion to the learned counsel for the Appellants to withdraw the present appeal and approach the learned Single Judge once again by filing a review petition, limited to the aspect of interest, which is the only issue raised in the present appeal.

6. Learned counsel for the Appellants accepts this suggestion given by the Court and seeks permission to withdraw the present appeal and approach the learned Single Judge by way of a review petition pressing for the claim of interest, on the ground that there was an inordinate and undue delay in payment of the revised pay as per the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC.

7. Leave and liberty as sought for, is granted.

8. Appeal stands disposed of as withdrawn.

9. Needless to state that the time taken in the filing of the present appeal and its disposal would be taken into account while considering the application for condonation of delay, if any, under Section 14 of the



Limitation Act.

10. Needless to say that it is always for the Appellants to approach this Court challenging the Judgment in case the review fails.

**SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J**

**VIMAL KUMAR YADAV, J**

**AUGUST 13, 2025/neha**