



2025:DHC:11366-DB



\$~19

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI*****Date of decision: 12.12.2025***+ **W.P.(C) 18854/2025 & CM APPL. 78470/2025
UNION OF INDIA AND ORS**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain, CGSC
with Mr. Kautilya Birat,
Mr. Ankush Kapoor and
Mr. Vishwadeep

versus

LAW EDIFYING GROUP AND ORSRespondentsThrough: Ms. Sumita Hazarika and
Mr. Prakhar Gupta, Advs.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN****NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)**

1. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 19.04.2022 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 393/2015, titled ***Law Edifying Group & Ors. v. Union of India through Secretary & Ors.***, whereby the learned Tribunal disposed of the O.A. filed by the respondent with the following directions:

"8. In these circumstances, we are of the considered opinion that the ends of justice would be met if the instant OA is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to verify whether the applicants are similarly situated employees as the applicants in Sudama Singh's



case (supra), and if they are so found, in that eventuality, grant them the similar benefits as have been extended to the applicants in Sudama Singh's case (supra) i.e. benefits of appropriate pay scales w.e.f. 01.01.1996, with payment of arrears of salary, but without the obligation of payment of interest. We order accordingly.

9. The respondents are further directed to complete the exercise, as ordained above, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs."

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the learned Tribunal has erred in placing reliance on the Order passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Patna Bench in O.A. No. 925/2003, titled ***Sudama Singh & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.***, inasmuch as the Supreme Court *vide* its Order dated 07.07.2014 passed in S.L.P.(C) No. 1587-1588/2014, had confined the relief granted therein only to the parties before it and not extended the same to others.

3. He further submits that the claim of the respondents was highly belated and therefore, should have been rejected on this ground alone.

4. He submits that in ***Union of India v. P.V. Hariharan***, (1997) 3 SCC 568, the Supreme Court cautioned that the learned Tribunal must refrain from interfering in matters of pay fixation, unless a clear case of outright discrimination is made out.

5. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners; however, we find no merit in the same. In fact, similar submissions were considered by us in ***Union of India and***



2025:DHC:11366-DB



Ors. v. Sanjoy Kar & Ors., 2025:DHC:10661-DB, and similar petitions were dismissed.

6. Accordingly, for the reasons recorded in our judgment in *Sanjoy Kar* (Supra), we find no merit in the present petition. The petition is, therefore, dismissed. The pending application also stands disposed of.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

DECEMBER 12, 2025/ys/P/SS