



\$~108

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

+ W.P.(C) 3787/2026 and CM APPL. 18546/2026
JAGDISH CHANDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Shakti Jaidwal, Advs.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITYRespondent

Through: Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr.
Sanjay Singh, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

24.03.2026

1. Through the present Petition, the Petitioner prays for quashing of the order dated 02.12.2025 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi [hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal'], whereby O.A. No.2012/2023 preferred by the Petitioner came to be dismissed.

2. The Petitioner had filed the aforesaid O.A. claiming that he was initially engaged as a casual worker ('Beldar') in May, 1974; was declared as 'Work Charge Staff' in 1976 and that his services were regularized in 1977. It is further his case that, on the basis of such regularization, he is entitled to consequential service and pensionary benefits. However, it is an admitted position that the Petitioner absented himself from duty in the year 1992 and did not thereafter rejoin service.

3. The Writ Petition was instituted in the year 2021. Upon search of records, the Respondents reported that no service record pertaining



to the Petitioner, namely Sh. Jagdish Chand s/o Sh. Laxman Dass was traceable. It was, however, indicated that one Sh. Jagdish Chand Jadwal s/o Sh. Laxmi Dass existed in the records, whose services had been regularized. The Petitioner failed to establish that he is the same person.

4. Consequently, the O.A. was dismissed, *inter alia*, noting that the Petitioner himself admits to having not attended office after 1992. In support of his case, the Petitioner relied only upon an Identity Card issued in the year 1989 and a letter dated 03.10.1989 calling upon him to resume duty. Apart from that, the Petitioner failed to produce any other documents.

5. Learned counsel for the Petitioner contends that, at the relevant time, names and parentage were recorded in a casual manner, and therefore, this Court ought to hold that the Petitioner's services stood regularized in 1977, entitling him to pensionary benefits.

6. The Tribunal has returned findings of fact upon appreciation of the material on record. There are material discrepancies not only in the Petitioner's name but also in the name of his father/parentage. Additionally, the O.A. itself came to be filed after an inordinate delay, i.e., in the year 2021.

7. In view of the aforesaid, no ground for interference is made out. The present Writ Petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

MARCH 24, 2026/sp/shah