



\$~116

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

+ **W.P.(C) 858/2026**

KARAN SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Himanshu Bodwal, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Syed Abdul Haseeb, CGSC and
Mohd. Aamir Khan, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **21.01.2026**

CM APPL. 4184/2026 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 858/2026

3. This petition has been filed with the following prayers:-

“a) To direct the Respondents to correctly revise and re-fix the Basic Pay of the Petitioner from the date of his initial appointment and at each stage of promotion, strictly in accordance with the applicable 5th, 6th and 7th Central Pay Commission Rules, CCS (Revised Pay) Rules, 2016 and Fundamental Rule 22(1)(a)(1), by extending to the Petitioner the benefit of option pay which was unlawfully denied to him due to administrative lapse;

b) To direct the Respondents to re-determine the Petitioner's Last Drawn Pay on the basis of such corrected pay fixation and to consequently re-fix the pension and all other retiral/pensionary benefits in accordance with Rule 44 read with other applicable provisions of the CCS (Pension) Rules, 2021;

c) To direct the Respondents to issue a revised Pension Payment Order (PPO) in favour of the Petitioner reflecting the



corrected Last Drawn Pay and revised pensionary benefits;
d) To direct the Respondents to release and pay to the Petitioner all consequential monetary benefits, including arrears of pay, arrears of pension and other retiral dues arising out of such re-fixation, along with interest at a reasonable rate as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit;
e) Declare the inaction of the Respondents in not correctly fixing the Petitioner's pay and in denying the statutory option under Fundamental Rule 22(I)(a)(1) as arbitrary, illegal, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India;
f) Pass such other and further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the interest of justice."

4. In effect, the petitioner seeks re-fixation of his basic pay from the date of his initial appointment; at each stage of promotion, taking into consideration the recommendations made by the successive pay commissions. On a specific query to the petitioner, he disclose the initial appointment of the petitioner was in the year 1987.

5. We also note, the petitioner had retired in the year 2023 as Inspector (GD), CRPF. The prayer is primarily for a benefits from the year 1987. There is no explanation why such a claim was not raised immediately on the appointment. Surely, such a claim after almost 38 years is hit by delay and latches, and we accordingly dismiss the petition.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

JANUARY 21, 2026/rk