



2025:DHC:9915-DB



\$~38

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI***Date of decision: 11.11.2025*+ **W.P.(C) 16922/2025**
UNION OF INDIA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Arti Bansal, CGSC with Ms.
Shruti Goel, Adv.

versus

DEVI SINGH SINCE DECEASED AND ANRRespondentsThrough: Ms. Vagisha Kochar, Adv. for
R2**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN****NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)****CAV 423/2025**

1. As the learned counsel for the respondents has entered her appearance in the instant matter, the caveat stands discharged.

CM APPL. 69564/2025 (Exemption)

2. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 16922/2025 & CM APPL. 69563/2025

3. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 30.05.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as, the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 2070/2015, titled *Devi Singh & Anr v. Union of India & Ors.* whereby the said O.A. filed by the respondents herein was allowed by the learned Tribunal in terms of an earlier Order passed by the learned Tribunal, Hyderabad Bench, dated 29.10.2018 in O.A. No. 743/2014 titled, *Sri B. Prasada Rao v. Union of India & Ors.*, which had been



upheld by the High Court of Telangana *vide Order dated 20.03.2019*, and later by the Supreme Court by dismissing the SLP (Civil) No. 14128/ 2019 filed there against, *vide Order dated 05.07.2019*.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner, placing reliance on the Judgment of this Court in ***Sh. Prabhakar Rao Thanikonda & Ors. v. Export Inspection Council & Ors.***, 2023: DHC: 8077-DB, submits that the relief has been wrongly granted to the respondents. We are unable to agree with the same.

5. The facts of the present case are identical to ***B. Prasada Rao*** (supra) wherein, it had been directed that due to the merger of the post of Technical Assistant with that of Technical Officer, pursuant to the 6th CPC recommendation with effect from 01.01.2006, the benefit of the first ACP granted to the post of Technical Officer has to be ignored.

6. In ***Prabhakar Rao*** (supra), the Court was considering a case where the officer concerned had been promoted to the post of Technical Officer and, therefore, the question of seeking the second financial upgradation was not found sustainable. Therefore, the said Judgment cannot come to the assistance of the petitioner.

7. In view of the above, we find no infirmity in the order passed by the learned Tribunal. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

NOVEMBER 11, 2025/ys/k/Yg