



\$~91

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

+ **W.P.(C) 14416/2025 and CM APPL. 59123/2025**

SUNEETA SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Suresh Kumar Pata, Advocate.**

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: **Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC with Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms. Aliza Alam and Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat, Advocates.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **17.09.2025**

1. By way of this writ petition, under Article 226 of the Constitution, petitioner seeks release of retiral benefits due to her late husband, Sh. Nirdosh, who served as a Technical Supervisor with respondent No. 2 – G.B. Pant Institute of Post Graduate Medical Education and Research [“Institute”]. Late Sh. Nirdosh retired on 31.03.2024, and passed away on 13.03.2025. It is the petitioner’s grievance that Late Sh. Nirdosh’s retiral dues were not released during his lifetime, and her subsequent representations have failed to elicit a response.

2. Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat, learned counsel for respondents, who appears on advance instructions, raises a preliminary objection that the Institute is an establishment of the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi and, therefore, any dispute concerning its employees will fall within the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal [“Tribunal”].



3. Without prejudice to his preliminary objection, Mr. Sehrawat submits that the aforesaid retiral dues could not be processed, as certain documents and information are still awaited from the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner or her representative can attend the office of the Institute on 22.09.2025, at 11:30 A.M., with all requisite documents, pursuant to which the retiral dues of Late Sh. Nirdosh will be computed and released to the petitioner expeditiously, subject to submission of the requisite documents.

4. The writ petition, alongwith the pending application, is accordingly disposed of in terms of Mr. Sehrawat's submission. In event of any dispute regarding the computation of retiral dues, the parties may attempt to reconcile the same. Failing such reconciliation, the petitioner's rights and remedies remain reserved, including the right to approach the Tribunal, if so advised.

5. It is made clear that the Court has not made any observation on the merits of the matter.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

SEPTEMBER 17, 2025

UK/sd/