



\$~39

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

Date of decision: 10.12.2025

+ W.P.(C) 9398/2018
ONKAR SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.R. K. Shukla, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms.Radhika Bishwajit Dubey,
CGSC with Ms.Gurleen Kaur
Waraich & Mr.Kritarth
Upadhyay, 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 30.10.2017 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the "Tribunal") in O.A. 3449/2011, titled *Onkar Singh v. UOI & Ors.*, dismissing the O.A. filed by the petitioner herein.

2. The petitioner had filed the above O.A. claiming therein that he is entitled to relief under Fundamental Rule 27 as there existed an anomaly between his pay and that of his junior.

3. He had submitted that the respondents, for the purpose of settling his pay, compared him with Shri Jugal Kishore Wadhwa, who was not in the same cadre, that is, UDC, and therefore, such comparison was incorrect.



4. He had further submitted that he should have been compared with Smt. Krishna Sharma, who is his junior.
5. The learned Tribunal held that, in terms of the OTBP scheme introduced by the respondents *vide* OM dated 09.09.1992, persons who were working as LDC/UDC and had rendered 26 years of service were thereby made eligible for promotion to TOA(G) Grade-III (BCR) scale by virtue of their total length of service. It was under this scheme that certain officers, depending on their length of service, were granted this scale. For others, like the petitioner, they were required to undertake a departmental examination, and upon clearing the same, they were then entitled to a higher pay scale.
6. On a similar issue, this Court, in its judgment in *MTNL and Anr. v. Jasbir Singh*, (2015) SCC OnLine Del 10053, has rejected the claim of the officer therein, that is, Shri Jasbir Singh, and directed that he should be given a pay parity on the same scale as Shri Jugal Kishore Wadhwa with effect from 01.07.1996. The learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to draw any distinction from that judgment.
7. Accordingly, we find no merit in the present petition. The same is dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

DECEMBER 10, 2025/rv/pb