



\$~6, 7 & 69

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

(6)+ W.P.(C) 16902/2025 & CM APPL. 69570/2025

ANANDI SHANKER SINGHPetitioner

Through: Mr.A.K. Trivedi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORSRespondents

Through: Mr.Vinay Yadav, CGSC with
Ms.Kamna Behrani and
Mr.Neeraj Paulose, Advs. for
R-1.

Mr.S.Rajappa,
Mr.R.Gowrishankar,
Mr.G.Dhivyasrai, Advs. for R-2
& 3.

(7) W.P.(C) 14702/2025

MS. S.V. SALVEPetitioner

Through: Ms.Smrati Sharma, Adv.

versus

KENDRIYA VIDYALAYA SANGATHAN & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr.S.Rajappa,
Mr.R.Gowrishankar,
Mr.G.Dhivyasrai, Advs. for R-
1.

(69) W.P.(C) 13808/2025

SATYANAND SHARMAPetitioner

Through: Mr.A.K. Trivedi, Adv.

versus

UOI & ORSRespondents

Through: Ms.Ekta Choudhary, Adv for



R-1.
Mr.S.Rajappa,
Mr.R.Gowrishankar,
Mr.G.Dhivyasrai, Advs. for R-2
& 3.

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

ORDER
12.11.2025

%

CM APPL. 70507/2025 in W.P.(C) 14702/2025

1. By way of the present application, the petitioner prays for an amendment in the cause title of the petition, stating that her name has been incorrectly mentioned as Ms. S.V. Salve before the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as, the 'Tribunal'), the correct name of the petitioner is Ms. V.S. Salve.
2. The petitioner, in support of her assertion, has placed on record a copy of her Aadhaar Card.
3. In view of the above, the application is allowed. The petitioner is directed to file the Amended Memo of the parties within a period of two weeks from today.

W.P.(C) 16902/2025 & CM APPL. 69570/2025
W.P.(C) 14702/2025
W.P.(C) 13808/2025

4. These petitions challenge the Orders passed by the learned Tribunal rejecting the O.As. filed by the petitioners herein, wherein they had, *inter alia*, prayed for grant of pensions in the GPF cum



Pension Scheme to them.

5. The issue raised by the petitioners is now covered by our Judgment dated 02.09.2025, titled ***Bharti Bahuguna v. Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan & Ors.***, 2025:DHC:7629-DB.

6. The learned counsel for the respondents has, however, raised an objection with respect to the delay in filing the present petitions.

7. We find merit in the said submission of the learned counsel for the respondents, however, at the same time, as the matter involves a claim of pension, we balance the equity by directing that, for the intervening period, that is, from the date of the Order passed by the learned Tribunal till the filing of the present Writ Petitions, the petitioners would not be entitled to claim interest on any amount found payable to them pursuant to the relief granted by us in the above referred Judgment.

8. The petitions, along with the pending application, are disposed of in the above terms.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

NOVEMBER 12, 2025/Arya/Yg