$~44

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

Date of decision: 14.10.2025

\+ W.P.(C) 15745/2025

UNION OF INDIA & ANR. .....Petitioners

Through: Mr Balendu Shekhar, CGSC with Mr.Divyansh Singh Dev, Mr.Krishna Chaitanya, Mr.Rajkumar Maurya, Advs. with Mr. Ashish Bhardwaj, CLA

versus

RAJENDAR SINGH .....Respondent

Through: None.

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

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPLs. 64428-29/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 15745/2025 CM APPL. 64427/2025 & 64430/2025

2. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 05.03.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 1374/2022, titled ***Rajendar Singh v. Union of India & Anr.***, allowing the O.A. filed by the respondent herein with the following direction:-

> *"7. In view of above, the present OA is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to pay interest at applicable GPF rates on delayed payment of all the retirement benefits including the gratuity from the date they were due till the date they were paid to the applicant, including the amount from DCRG which was withheld by the respondents till date, the same was refunded in May, 2024. This exercise shall be complied with by the respondents within eight weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this Order."*

3. The limited grievance of the petitioners is that the learned Tribunal has erred in issuing a direction to pay interest at applicable GPF rates on delayed payment of all the retiral benefits. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, in accordance with the applicable Rules, interest is not payable on certain components of the retiral benefits, barring gratuity, and in any case, a uniform rate applicable to the GPF could not have been applied.

4. We are unable to accept the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioners.

5. In the present case, admittedly, the retiral dues owed to the respondent were withheld, and the petitioners had failed to give any satisfactory reason as to why the pay of the respondent had been refixed at the time of his superannuation. In fact, the petitioners admitted before the learned Tribunal that the re-fixation done was not proper and have refunded the amount to the respondent.

6. In the given facts, we find no infirmity in the Order passed by the learned Tribunal directing the petitioners to, therefore, pay interest at the applicable GPF rates on the delayed payment of all the retiral

benefits to the respondent. The Rules would not be a bar on the power of the learned Tribunal to award interest in such circumstances.

7. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed. The pending applications also stand disposed of.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

OCTOBER 14, 2025/*rv/ik*