



\$~29

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 17797/2025**
RADHA DEVIPetitioner
Through: Mr. Ramesh Rawat, Adv.
versus
THE DIRECTOR GENERAL, CSIR & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Bhuvnesh Satija, Mr.
Aniket Khanduri, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

% **17.12.2025**

1. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 14.11.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 3845/2023, titled **Radha Devi, Group D v. The Director General and Ors.**, whereby the learned Tribunal dismissed the O.A. filed by the petitioner herein, on the ground of delay and laches.
2. By the above O.A., the petitioner had prayed for the following reliefs:

"8.1 Call for the service records of the applicant's husband.

8.2 Examine whether the impugned order is in conformity of the orders on the subject matter of grant of family pension to the spouse of the temporary status employees and if not quash and set aside impugned order dated 25.09.2023.

8.3 Direct the respondents to grant family pension and all other benefits to the applicant, treating her husband, late Sh. Upender Rai at par with temporary Group 'D' employees post 3 years after grant of temporary status to him.

8.3 Award the interest @10% p.a. on the arrears of pension and retirement benefits as



aforesaid.

8.4 Pass such other or further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case."

3. As the claim was one for grant of family pension, in our view, in terms of the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Union of India and Others. v. Tarsem Singh***, (2008) 8 SCC 648, it constituted a continuing cause of action, and the only effect of any delay would have been to confine the relief of the petitioner, if so entitled, to a period of three years prior to the date of filing of the O.A..
4. The above position is not seriously disputed by the learned counsel for the respondents.
5. Accordingly, the Impugned Order passed by the learned Tribunal is set aside, and the O.A. is restored to its original number, with the above observation.
6. It is held that, in case the petitioner is found entitled to the relief claimed, the learned Tribunal shall confine the relief to a period of three years prior to the date of filing of the O.A. by the petitioner.
7. The parties shall appear before the learned Tribunal on 14th January, 2026, for further directions.
8. The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

DECEMBER 17, 2025/prg/RM/DG