



\$~34

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 783/2025**

ANAND PRATAP SINGH AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber and Mr.
Anshuman Mehrotra, Advocates.

versus

SHRI GOVIND MOHAN AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Farman Ali, CGSC along with
Ms. Usha Jamnal, Advocates and AC
Raj Saxena (Ministerial BSF).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

% **07.01.2026**

1. The present petition alleges non-compliance of the directions contained in the judgment / order dated 12.02.2025 passed in W.P (C) No. 1743 of 2025. The same, *inter alia*, directs as under:

“6. In view of the above, we dispose of the present petition by directing the respondents to consider the contents of the present petition as a representation of the petitioners. In case the petitioners are found entitled to the relief in terms of our Judgment in Sushil Kumar (supra), the same should be granted to the petitioners within a period of eight weeks from today. However, if there is any order to the contrary passed by the Supreme Court, as far as Sushil Kumar (supra) is concerned, our directions would also be equally affected as far as the petitioners are concerned.

7. With the above directions, the present petition is disposed of”

2. During the course of hearing, Mr. Farman Ali, learned counsel for the respondents submits that a speaking order dated 06.01.2026 has been passed in compliance with the aforesaid directions; a copy of the same has been handed over during the course of hearing. The same, *inter alia*, reads as



under:-

“11. Keeping in view the above mentioned position, the Writ Petition of the petitioners in the instant case has been examined in detail considering it a representation. The MoF resolution dated 29th August 2008 expressly govern particular groups of services and, hence, manifestly does not apply in case of the petitioners. The post held by the petitioners belongs to a different cadre (Group ‘B’) whereas the NFU is granted to the Group ‘A’ cadre only. Further, Inspector (Pharmacist) Sushil Kumar of the ITBP belongs to the Paramedics cadre whereas the petitioners here belong to the General Duty cadre where the further promotional avenues are available. Also, ‘the Sushil Kumar and others V/S UOI’ case has not yet been finalized as the review petition filed by the UOI is pending finalization. Considering the aforementioned grounds, the prayer made by the petitioners in their representation, therefore, cannot be acceded to. Therefore, the claim of the petitioners for the benefit of Non-Functional Upgradation in the Grade pay of Rs. 5400/- in Pay Band-3, on completion of 4 years of service in the Grade Pay of Rs. 4800/-, is hereby rejected being devoid of merit.”

3. In the circumstances, no further orders are required to be passed in the present petition; the same is, accordingly, disposed of.
4. Needless to say, the petitioners would be at liberty to take appropriate remedies against the aforesaid speaking order dated 06.01.2026.

SACHIN DATTA, J

JANUARY 7, 2026/r