



\$~12

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1673/2026 & CM APPL. 8089/2026**

SHRI RITESH MAHAJAN & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Puneet Bajaj, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain, ASC with Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Ms. Vishruti Pandey and Mr. Sachin Garg, Advocates for R-1.

Mrs. Anita Sahani, Mr. Vikram Singh and Mr. Satwik Mitra, Advocates for R-2.

Mr. Pritish Sabharwal, ASC with Ms. Shweta and Mr. Shiv Chopra, Advocates for R-2/ GGSIPU.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

11.02.2026

%

1. This petition under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India impugns Memorandum dated 9th January, 2026, whereby Petitioner No. 1 has been directed to deposit a sum of INR 3,05,579/- with the Finance & Accounts Department of Respondent No. 2, failing which the said amount is to be recovered from his salary in instalments. The petitioners also assail Memorandum dated 25th March, 2025, to the extent it restricts the grant of Fixed Medical Allowance (FMA) to only one spouse where both husband and wife are employed with the University, and its consequential



retrospective application resulting in recovery proceedings.

2. Ms. Anita Sahani, counsel for Respondent No. 2, on instructions, submits that apart from the petitioner, seventeen other similarly placed employees have submitted representations and it is likely that further such representations may also be received. She states that in view of the aforesaid, Respondent No. 2 has decided to examine all such representations collectively and, till a final decision is taken thereon, the impugned recovery orders shall not be given effect to.

3. In view of the statement made on behalf of Respondent No. 2 that the issue is under reconsideration and that the representations shall be examined, this Court does not deem it necessary to keep the present petition pending. Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to Respondent No. 2 to treat the writ petition as a representation and to examine and decide the same along with the other similarly placed representations by way of a reasoned and speaking order within a period of six weeks from today.

4. In the event the decision is adverse to the petitioner, liberty is reserved to him to avail remedies in accordance with law. It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the rival contentions.

5. The next date of hearing stands cancelled.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

FEBRUARY 11, 2026^{hc}