$~6

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10693/2023 & CM APPLs. 41460/2023, 17820/2024

VIMAL KUMAR .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashwin Kumar D.S., Ms. Surbhi Mehta & Mr. Ishan Roy Chowdhury, Advocates.

versus

INDIAN POSTS PAYMENTS BANK LTD. (IPPB).....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar Gautam, Ms. Likivi K. Jakhalu, Mr. Deepanjal Choudhary, Ms. Azal Aekram, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

O R D E R

% 10.09.2025

1. The present writ petition concerns the Annual Performance Appraisal Report ["APAR"] grading of the petitioner for the year 2021–2022, in which the final score awarded to him is 63, resulting in a rating of "*3: Good*". Mr. Ashwin Kumar D.S., learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the grading is illegal and does not conform to the Performance Management System Overview disclosed by the respondent–Indian Posts Payments Bank Ltd. ["Bank"]. It prejudices the petitioner inasmuch as a minimum score of 75 is required for consideration for promotion. Mr. Ashwin Kumar D.S. also submits that only the final score of 63 and the final rating of "*Good*" were disclosed to the petitioner, but the detailed assessment leading to the aforesaid grading

was not furnished. He relies upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Dev Dutt v. Union of India*, [(2008) 8 SCC 725] in this regard.

2. Mr. Rajesh Kumar Gautam, learned counsel for the respondent, differs from this interpretation of the judgment in *Dev Dutt* (*supra*) and submits that, after the year in question, i.e., with effect from the year 2022–2023, the Bank has, in fact, begun disclosing detailed attribute-wise scores to its employees as part of the APAR disclosure.

3. Alongwith the counter affidavit, the respondent has placed on record a Performance Management System Overview, which contains detailed instructions relating to self-appraisal by employees as well as guidelines for the Reporting Authority, Reviewing Authority, and Accepting Authority.

4. Without prejudice to the other rights and contentions of the parties, and at the request of Mr. Gautam, two weeks' time is granted to file an additional affidavit disclosing the manner in which the petitioner's appraisal for the year in question was carried out, so as to enable consideration of whether the procedure adopted was compliant with the guidelines.

5. List on 18.12.2025, in the category of "*After notice miscellaneous matters*".

PRATEEK JALAN, J

SEPTEMBER 10, 2025
'pv/JM'/