



\$~72

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 16762/2025, CM APPL. 68791/2025, CM APPL. 68792/2025 & CM APPL. 68793/2025**
COMMISSIONER OF POLICE & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Syed Abdul Haseeb, CGSC
and Mr. Arvind Singh Rawat,
ASI.

versus

YOUNGESH KUMAR GULATI & ORS.Respondents
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

% **ORDER**
12.01.2026

1. By way of the present writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners challenge the order dated 23.05.2025 (hereafter '**impugned order**'), passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal in O.A. No. 3522/2017.
2. By the impugned order, the learned CAT has allowed the Original Application ('**O.A.**') filed by the Respondents and set aside the order dated 13.06.2017, whereby the benefit of the 3rd MACP granted to the respondents was withdrawn on the ground that the respondents were not parties in O.A. No. 1288/2014 titled **Manju Vashishta and Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.** Consequently, by the impugned order it was directed that the benefits be restored to the respondents.
3. Reliance was placed by the learned Tribunal on the judgment



dated 23.05.2016 in OA No. 1288/2014 titled ***Manju Vashistha and Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.***, which was upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by a detailed order passed on 17.08.2021 in Special Leave Petition (C.) No.31921/2018. The learned Tribunal also placed reliance on the judgment in ***Staff Selection Commission & Ors. v. Darpan Sharma : 2024:DHC:9059-DB***, where this Court had observed that once an identically situated candidate was granted a relief by the High Court, other similarly situated candidates could not be accorded different treatments by the Courts.

4. Learned counsel representing the Petitioners does not dispute the aforesaid positions of law. Although he made a sincere attempt, however, he has failed to point any cogent distinguishing factor between the case of ***Manju Vashistha and Ors. (supra)*** and the present case to convince this Court that the respondents ought not to be accorded the benefit of 3rd MACP. The learned Tribunal has rightly observed that the benefit being denied to the respondents on the sole ground of them not being applicants in O.A. No. 1288/2014 shows non-application of mind.

5. In view of the above, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the impugned order.

6. The present petition is accordingly dismissed. Pending Applications also stand disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JANUARY 12, 2026/“SK”