



\$~87

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 827/2026, CM APPL. 4077/2026 and CM APPL. 4078/2026

DR. URVASHI SINHAPetitioner
Through: Mr. Siddharth Naidu, Adv.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI, THROUGH
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY & ANR.Respondents
Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC
GNCTD-Services with Mr.
Uday Singh Ahlawat, Mrs.
Tania Ahlawat, Mr. Nitesh
Kumar Singh, Ms. Aliza Alam,
Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER
21.01.2026

%

1. The present Writ Petition, filed by the Petitioner, assails the correctness of the order dated 29.07.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi [hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'], in O.A. No. 3057/2022, as well as the order dated 01.07.2021 and the corrigendum dated 02.07.2021 [hereinafter referred to collectively as 'Impugned Orders'] issued by the Respondents.

2. It is the case of the Petitioner, who was appointed as Civil Assistant Surgeon (Dental) Grade-I on an *ad hoc* basis in the year 1998, along with 18 other Doctors, that her service was arbitrarily terminated despite her long tenure and entitlement to various service



benefits.

3. It is an undisputed fact that the Petitioner continued to serve on an *ad hoc* basis for over 20 years, with her tenure being extended from time to time in accordance with extant rules and prior directions of the Tribunal. In early 2019, the Petitioner sought and was granted leave without pay to travel to the United States of America to join her family, remaining on leave for nearly one year.

4. Subsequently, on 04.01.2021, the Petitioner again applied for leave from 18.02.2021 to 17.02.2022, which was sanctioned by the relevant authority. Notwithstanding the sanctioned leave, the Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor of the National Capital Territory of Delhi declined to grant any extension of her *ad hoc* tenure beyond 28.02.2021.

5. Thereafter, the Petitioner approached the Tribunal through an Original Application seeking regularization of her services. The Tribunal, after considering the matter, dismissed the application. Aggrieved by the same, the Petitioner has filed the present Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking, *inter alia*, regularization, reinstatement, and payment of allowances in parity with other regular appointees.

6. The Court has heard learned counsel for the Petitioner at length. Learned counsel emphasized that in a previous round of litigation, the Tribunal had directed that Doctors working on *ad hoc* basis were entitled to receive various allowances and benefits at par with regular Doctors, including but not limited to leave benefits, increments, gratuity, and other service-related entitlements. Learned counsel further contends that the Petitioner, having served for over two decades, was removed from her employment without proper notice or



justification, and that the Respondents have failed to implement the benefits as directed in the earlier Tribunal orders.

7. Upon careful consideration of the pleadings, records, and submissions made, it is evident that:

- i. The Petitioner was engaged on an ad hoc basis and has not demonstrated any legal entitlement to continue in service beyond the period sanctioned by the competent authority;
- ii. The Petitioner had availed extended periods of leave, including leave without pay for nearly one year and subsequent sanctioned leave from 18.02.2021 to 17.02.2022, which further complicates her claim to continuous service;
- iii. There is no material to establish a legal or vested right for the Petitioner to remain in the post indefinitely or to claim automatic regularization of her service.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no grounds to interfere with the Impugned Orders terminating the Petitioner's *ad hoc* engagement.

9. However, this Court notes that the Petitioner has specifically raised a claim regarding payment of allowances and benefits in compliance with the previous orders of the Tribunal, which has not been adjudicated by the Tribunal in the present proceedings. Considering the settled principle of law that entitlements and benefits directed by the Tribunal must be implemented by the Respondents, the Petitioner is granted liberty to file a separate application before the Tribunal for adjudication of this specific aspect. The Tribunal shall decide the same expeditiously, preferably within a period of three months from the date of filing.



10. In light of the foregoing, the present Writ Petition along with all pending applications stands disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

ANISH DAYAL, J.

JANUARY 21, 2026/sp/pal