



\$~55

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **W.P.(C) 14923/2025**  
**CENTRAL BOARD OF TRUSTEE** .....Petitioner  
Through: Mr. Siddharth, Standing  
Counsel with Mr. Kaushik  
Kumar Dey, Panel counsel and  
Mr. Prateek Goyal and Ms.  
Kavya Dixit, Advs.

versus

**HARI KISHAN & ANR.** .....Respondents  
Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC with  
Ms. Aliza Alam, Adv. for R-2.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**  
**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN**

**ORDER**

% **25.09.2025**

**CM APPL. 61404/2025 & CM APPL. 61405/2025 (Exemptions)**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

**W.P.(C) 14923/2025 & CM APPL. 61403/2025**

2. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 08.05.2018 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 949/2015, titled ***Sh. Hari Kishan v. Delhi Transport Corporation & Ors.***, whereby the learned Tribunal allowed the said O.A. filed by the respondent no.1 herein, with the following directions:

*"11. It is quite clear from the records that the applicant has been a DTC pension optee. The EPF deductions from salary, qua the*



*applicant, have been done by the DTC inadvertently. The DTC has accordingly written to the RPFC vide letter dated 14.11.2014 (p .26) seeking refund of the EPF deductions, qua the applicant. The RPFC has also indicated its willingness to refund the said amount vide its Annexure A-10 letter dated 05.02.2015. Let this matter be pursued by the respondent Nos. 1 & 2: - DTC with the RPFC and get the EPF deductions refunded, qua the applicant, from RPFC and credited to the DTC Pension Trust within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. It is directed that the DTC shall sanction pension to the applicant within a period of three months thereafter.”*

3. At the outset, we would note that though the Impugned Order has been passed on 08.05.2018, the present writ petition has been filed only on 22.09.2025, that is, after expiry of almost seven years of the passing of the Impugned Order. There is no explanation for this delay in approaching this Court.

4. The petition, along with the pending applications, is dismissed on the grounds of delay and laches.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**MADHU JAIN, J**

**SEPTEMBER 25, 2025/b/k/Dg**