



\$~1

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 1186/2026, CAV 39/2026 and CM APPL. 5777/2026

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Himanshu Pathak, SPC
with Mr. Chetan Sharma, Adv.

versus

SHRI VINOD PRASAD & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr.Adv. for R-1[appearance
not given.]

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

18.02.2026

%

1. Through the present Petition, the Petitioners seek issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari by assailing the correctness of the orders dated 31.05.2023 and 25.09.2025 [hereinafter referred to as 'Impugned Orders'] passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal [hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal']. *Vide* the Impugned Order dated 31.05.2023, the O.A. filed by the Respondent No.1 was allowed by holding him entitled to one additional mark for DRM Cash Award and with directions to the Petitioners to reconsider the case of the Respondent No.1 for promotion. The Review Application filed by the Petitioners against the said order was dismissed *vide* Impugned Order dated 25.09.2025.

2. The Respondent No.1 is stated to be working as Loco Pilot Goods. He was awarded DRM Cash Award for his excellent service during the period of 2014-15. As per the policy of the Petitioners, the employees are entitled to one additional mark for a DRM Cash Award



for their excellent service, however, while the Departmental Promotion Committee ('DPC') was being held, the said additional mark was inadvertently not claimed by Respondent No.1. Thereafter, he filed O.A. No.250/2016, which was allowed by the Tribunal. The Tribunal, in paragraph no.14, issued the followed directions:

"14. In these facts and circumstances of the case, we find merit in the case and the applicant is entitled for one extra on mark. Accordingly, we allow this OA and set aside the impugned order dated 18.12.2015 and promotion order dated 22.12.2015 qua the private respondent No. 4 herein by directing the respondents to re-consider the case of the applicant, as observed above, as expeditiously as possible within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. However, he shall not be entitled for any monetary benefits. No costs."

3. Learned counsel representing the Petitioners admits that promotion of the Respondent No.3/Shri Mahendra Kumar Sharma has been withdrawn by the Department. It is submitted that the DRM Cash Award was granted on 27.04.2015, whereas, the cut-off date for considering the said award was 31.03.2015. Learned counsel further submits that there may be other candidates also who would be entitled to a similar additional mark.

4. This Court has considered the submissions advanced by the learned counsel representing the Petitioners.

5. It is evident that the Respondent No.1 has been awarded the DRM Cash Award for his excellent service during the period of 2014-15. The said award might have been given subsequently; however, the promotion order was passed in December 2015. Hence, the DRM Cash Award granted to the Respondent No.1 was required to be taken into account while holding the DPC.

6. With regard to the second submission, it will be noted here that the Tribunal has only directed the Petitioners to re-consider the case of



the Respondent No.1. While reconsidering, the Petitioners are entitled to take into consideration the candidature of various other candidates.

7. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court is of the considered view that the Tribunal has taken a plausible view and finds no ground to interfere with the Impugned Orders in exercise of its writ jurisdiction.

8. The present Petition is accordingly dismissed.

9. However, the question of law with respect to taking into account the DRM Cash Award in a particular manner is kept open.

10. The pending applications also stand closed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

FEBRUARY 18, 2026

jai/kb