



\$~3 and 5

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

+ CONT.CAS(C) 1091/2024 and CM APPLs.53512/2024, 63297/2024,
59539/2025

(3) D.G.O.F. EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION AND ANR.....Petitioners

versus

SHRI GIRIDHAR ARAMANE AND ORS

.....Respondents

+ CONT.CAS(C) 31/2025 and CM APPL.59608/2025

(5) ALL INDIA ORDINANCE FACTORIES SCHEDULED CASTES
AND SCHEDULED TRIBES EMPLOYEES WELFARE
ASSOCIATION AND ORSPetitioners

versus

SHRI SANJEEV KUMAR IAS

.....Respondent

Through:

Presence:

Ms. Kiran Suri, Sr. Adv., Ms. Aishwarya Kumar and Ms. Laxmi, Advs. for
petitioner in item nos.3 and 5.

Mr. M.C. Dhingra, Sr. Adv., Mr. Tashriq Ahmad, Ms. Farzeen Iqbal, Mr.
Gaurav Dhingra and Mr. Shashank Singh, Advs. for impleading applicant in
CM-63297/2024.

Mr. C.A. Brijesh, Mr. Ritwik Sharma and Mr. Ishith Arora, Advs. for
Sharad Mehra in item nos.3 and 5.

Ms. Manisha Agarwal Narain, CGSC, Mr. Siddhant Soni, Mr. Nipun Jain,
Ms. Dimpri Vaid, Mr. Rishabh Dev, Advs. along with Mr. Abhijit Deb, Mr.
S. N. Saha, Mr. Ashish Paul from Directorate of Ordinance.

Mr. Rajkumar Maurya, GP in item no.5.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

30.03.2026

1. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners submits that the directions
contained in the judgment/ order dated 14.10.2014 in W.P.(C) 4606/2013
stand substantially complied with, except in so far as grant of consequential



benefits is concerned.

2. Paragraph-26 of the said judgment / order reads as under:

“26. The petitioners were treated historically as equals to CSS/CSSS employees and enjoyed equal pay and all benefits flowing from equal pay. This was based on the previous four instances of determinations by successive Pay Commissions that they performed equal work. No other evidence of “complete identity” of work was necessary in the circumstances of the case. The materials on the record do show that the Sixth CPC stated in more than one place specifically that historical parity in pay scales ought not to be disturbed. Such being the case, this Court is of the opinion that the CAT fell into error in holding that differentiation was facially justified, and could not be gone into given the nature of restricted judicial review. Consequently, a direction is issued to the respondents to fix the members of the Petitioner Association and other similarly placed Assistants working in Ordnance Factories and in OFB in the same pay scale as was given to Assistants similarly placed in CSS/CSSS, Army Headquarters, UPSC, CAT, MEA, Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, etc. with effect from the same date as was first given to them. Consequential pay fixation and fitment orders shall be issued within eight weeks from today. The writ petition is allowed in the above terms without any order as to costs.”

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners submits that the respondent, while correctly fixing the initial pay, did not grant the consequential pay fixation and fitment benefits in full, at par with CSS / CSSS, Armed Forces Headquarters, Railway Board and other similarly placed employees having historical parity with CSS / CSSS.

4. As such, it is contended that the respondents have only partially complied with the aforesaid judgment.

5. There is merit in the contention advanced by the petitioner that, in terms of the directions contained in paragraph-26 of the judgment dated 14.10.2014, the pay scale of Assistants/ Personal Assistants working in Ordnance Factories and the OFB is required to be fixed at par with that of



similarly placed Assistants in CSS/ CSSS, AFHQ (Army Headquarters), the Railway Board, etc., along with all consequential benefits of pay fixation and fitment. Consequently, once such parity in pay scale was directed to be granted together with all attendant benefits, the same is required to be maintained and continued throughout the course of service.

6. The infirmity / deficiency in the manner in which consequential benefits have been given has been brought out in a tabular form by the petitioner as under:

Event	If pay fixed at par with CSS/CSSS, Army Headquarter etc.	Pay actually fixed for OFB Headquarter employees	Financial lose in basic pay/month and/or difference in Grade Pay/Level in pay matrix
Pay fixation in Assistant grade (promoted to Assistant on 14.11.2012)	12540+4600= 17140	12540+4600= 17140	Nil
Pay fixed on 7 th CPC w.e.f. 01.01.2016	Level-7 (grade pay 4600) Rs.49000/-	Level-7 (grade pay 4600) Rs.49000/-	Nil
Consequential pay fixation on promotion to next higher grade on 01.03.2020	Level-8 (4800 grade pay) Rs. 56900/-	Level-7 (4600 grade pay) Rs. 56900/-	Difference in Grade Pay/Level in pay matrix w.r.t. CSS/CSSS/AFHQ
Consequential pay fixation after 4 years on NFU on 01.03.2024	Level-10 (5400 grade pay) Rs. 69000/-	Level-7 (4600 grade pay) Rs. 66000/-	Difference in pay Rs. 3000/- & difference in Grade Pay/Level in pay matrix w.r.t. CSS/CSSS/AFHQ
Pay as on 01.01.2025	Level-10 (5400 grade pay) Rs. 71100/-	Level-7 (4600 grade pay) Rs. 68000/-	Difference in pay Rs. 3100/- & difference in Grade Pay/Level in pay matrix w.r.t. CSS/CSSS/AFHQ



7. In the circumstances, the respondents are directed to re-fix the pay of the petitioners to ensure that there is parity, in the manner brought out in the above table.
8. Let necessary compliance be done as expeditiously as possible, and preferably within a period of eight weeks from today.
9. The petitions are disposed of in the above terms.
10. List for reporting compliance on 06.08.2026.

SACHIN DATTA, J

MARCH 30, 2026/cl