



2025:DHC:9552-DB



\$~6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI*****Date of decision: 31.10.2025***

+ W.P.(C) 16507/2025

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Jagdish Chandra, CGSC
with Mr. Sujeet Kumar, Adv.

versus

SHRI LAXMAN SINGH AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Utkarsh Kandpal, Adv.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN****NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)****CAV 415/2025**

1. As the learned counsel for the respondents has entered an appearance in the instant matter, the caveat stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 16507/2025 & CM APPLs. 67642-44/2025

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioners, challenging the Order dated 12.03.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 2922/2021, titled ***Laxman Singh & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.***, whereby the learned Tribunal allowed the O.A. filed by the respondents herein with the following directions:

"13. In view of the same, we hereby are allowing the present Original Application by



quashing and setting aside the impugned order in so far as fixing the crucial date of determination as on 20.11.2019 and the crucial date for clarification ought to be from the date of the Notification, ie, 09.04.2009, when the office memorandum became operational. Consequently, the applicants shall be entitled to the benefits with effect from the date of order. The aforesaid exercise shall be carried out within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. All pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of. No costs."

3. The dispute raised by the petitioners is covered by the Judgment of this Court in ***All India Audit & Accounts Officers Association & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.***, 2013:DHC:4691-DB, wherein this Court, after considering the CCS (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008 and S.O. 946(E) issued on 09.04.2009, had held as under:

"17. In this case, the petitioner's argument for status is not based on equal pay vis-à-vis another set of officers, but on an independent classification conducted under the Revised Rules of 2008 and the DOPT memoranda themselves, that took into account all relevant factors in deciding the classification of various officers. Here, the text of the Rules and the Office Memoranda supports the Petitioners. One aspect which has to be highlighted here is that even under the pre 2008 dispensation, the cadre to which the second and third petitioner belong had been placed on par with Group A in terms of the pay scale; significantly, their classification was as Group B officers. The 2008 Rules brought about a radical change in that they, as well as the Memoranda in question, unambiguously placed the Petitioners' posts in PB-3 and clearly spelt out their classification as Group A officers

18. Finally, on the question of the mandatory consultation with the UPSC for the



upgradation of the officers in question from Group B to Group B, the CAT order does not mention the particulars of any rule that requires such consultation. Neither has the learned counsel for the Central Government despite an opportunity granted by this Court through its order dated 10.9.2013 placed on record any circular/memorandum that such requires such consultation.

19. Accordingly, the impugned order of the CAT dated 10.12.2012, as also the Office Memoranda of the Central Government dated 11.4.2011, 17.6.2011 and 7.7.2011, which deny the petitioners classification as Group A officers along-with the attendant benefits, are liable to be set aside as unreasonable and arbitrary given the clear textual mandate of the relevant rules. Thus, the classification of Senior Audit and Senior Accounts officers as Group A officers is mandated under the applicable rules. A direction in terms of the claims made by the petitioners is given; effect shall be given by the respondents, to these directions within six weeks. The writ petition is allowed in these terms, without any order as to costs."

4. The above Judgement has been upheld by the Supreme Court by dismissing the Special Leave Appeal (C) No. 29186/2014 *vide* Order dated 21.08.2018

5. In view of the above, we do not find any merit in the present petition. The same, along with the pending applications, is accordingly dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

OCTOBER 31, 2025/b/P/DG