



\$~59

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9926/2023**

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms.Manisha Agrawal, Mr.Nipur Jain,
Advocates and Mr.Abhishek Singh.

Versus

TITU RAM AND 39 OTHERS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Siddhartha Sinha, Mr. Nring
Chawibo Zeliang and Ms. Anu Priya
Nisha, Advocates for respondent Nos.1,
3, 4, 5, 9, 16, 23, 24, 27, 28, 32 and 35
Mr. Ajit Kakkar, Mr.Arjun Goel and
Mr.Tejas Bhange, Advocates for
respondent Nos.6, 17, 21, 30, 36 to 40

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

%

16.03.2026

CM APPL. 3833/2026 (stay by the petitioners)

1. The present application has been preferred by the petitioners seeking stay of the order dated 05.12.2025 passed in Execution Petition No. 58 of 2022 titled Titu Ram & Others vs Union of India, Execution Petition No. 59 of 2022 titled Karan Singh & Others vs Union of India and Execution Petition No. 158 of 2022 titled Chiranjee Lal & Others vs Union of India.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that vide the aforesaid orders, the Executing Court has issued warrants of attachment. It is further submitted



that vide order dated 21.02.2026, the Executing Court directed the State Bank of India, Delhi Cantt. Branch, to attach Account No. 3046884844, and the said account has been attached to the extent of Rs.3,32,23,587/-.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the petitioners have obtained conditional sanction of Rs.9,88,57,903.76/-, being the decretal amount in all the three execution petitions calculated up to 30.01.2026, and that the same shall be deposited before this Court within a period of three weeks from today.

4. An undertaking in the form of an affidavit of Major Rohit Choudhary, Second-in-Command, has also been filed. The same is accepted and taken on record.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that attachment of the salary account has adversely impacted the day-to-day functioning as well as the payment of salaries.

6. Learned counsel for the non-applicant/respondents submits that he has no objection to the vacation of the order of attachment. However, he submits that vide the impugned award, the petitioners were directed to regularise the services of the workmen, and despite the aforesaid directions, the workmen are, till date, being paid only daily wages. It is further submitted that there is no stay of the impugned award.

7. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions from Major Abhishek Singh, Officer Commanding (OC), Fuel, Oil and Lubricant (FOL), Delhi Cantt., states that the differential amount of wages shall also be deposited. The said undertaking is accepted and taken on record, and the



petitioners are bound by the terms thereof.

8. Subject to the petitioners depositing the aforesaid amount before this Court within the time undertaken, the impugned order, to the extent it directs attachment of the aforesaid account, shall remain in abeyance.

9. In view of the above, the present application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 9926/2023

List on 28.04.2026, the date already fixed.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

MARCH 16, 2026/na