



\$~70

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

+ W.P.(C) 18085/2025, CM APPL. 74783/2025 and CM APPL. 74784/2025

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.Petitioners
Through: Mr. Shahshak Dixit, CGSC
along with Mr. Kunal Raj, Adv.

versus

FIRDOSE ASIA S & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Shyamal Narain and Ms.
Sthavi Asthana, Advs. for R-24,
29, 35, 43, 45, 46, 49, 52, 56,
57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65,
66, 67 & 68.

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

ORDER
18.02.2026

%

1. By way of the present Petition, the Petitioner prays for issuance of a Writ in the nature of *Certiorari* for quashing the impugned Order dated 05.09.2024 [hereinafter referred to as 'IO'] passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi [hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'].

2. Briefly stated, the facts giving rise to the present round of litigation are that the Respondents (Applicants before the Tribunal) being aggrieved by the wrongful fixation of their pay by the Petitioners (Respondent before the Tribunal), pursuant to the acceptance of the revised pay structure under the recommendations of the 6th Central Pay Commission filed an Original Application (OA) before the Tribunal. The said OA filed by the Respondents came to be



allowed.

3. The Tribunal, while allowing the OA by way of the IO, placed reliance upon the decision dated 09.08.2012 passed by Central Administrative Tribunal, Allahabad Bench [hereinafter referred to as 'Allahabad Bench'] in O.A. No.293/2011, which was subsequently upheld by the Allahabad High Court, Lucknow Bench, *vide* judgment dated 01.12.2022 in W.P. (C) 13860/2013 & connected matters.

4. The said judgment of the Allahabad High Court was affirmed by the Supreme Court by way of the Order dated 22.08.2023 passed in SLP(C) Diary No. 24270/2023. Whereas the Review Petition (C) Diary No.11687/2024, preferred against the Order dated 22.08.2023, was also dismissed on 18.07.2024.

5. Learned counsel representing the Petitioner admits that the cases of Respondent Nos.24, 29, 35, 43, 45, 46, 49, 52, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68 and 73 are identical. The Applicants before the Allahabad Bench are similarly placed as these Respondents and are presently serving in the same office, i.e. the O/o of the Comptroller General of Defence Accounts ('CDGA').

6. It is also not in dispute that the aforesaid Respondents were promoted during the period from 01.01.2006 to 29.08.2008 and that their pay was to be re-fixed as per Rule 11 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2016. However, learned counsel submits that the case of the remaining Respondents is distinguishable, since their case is not covered by the judgment dated 09.08.2012 passed by the Allahabad Bench and as such, they were not eligible to the said relief.

7. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the Writ Petition is liable to be dismissed, while upholding the IO *qua* the covered Respondents.



However, liberty is granted to the Petitioner No.1 to seek review before the Tribunal *qua* the remaining Respondents, while establishing that the cases of remaining Respondents other than those referred to in paragraph No.5 are distinguishable and that they are not entitled to the same relief.

8. With these observations, the present Petition, along with all pending applications, stands disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

FEBRUARY 18, 2026

s.godara/hr