



\$~207

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

+ CONT.CAS(C) 1913/2025

MANISH KUMAR SINGH & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sahil Chandra & Mr. Mohit Kr.
Maurya, Advs.

versus

DALJIT SINGH CHAUDHARY & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sandeep Tyagi, SPC for UOI with
Mr. Madhurendra Jha, GP.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

% **17.12.2025**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

CMA PPL.79681/2025(Exemption)

2. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. The application stands disposed of.

CONT.CAS(C) 1913/2025

3. The present petition under Article 215 of the Constitution of India, 1950 seeks the following prayers:-

“(a) Initiate contempt proceedings against the Respondents for contempt of the directions passed vide the order dated 22.10.2024 passed by this Hon’ble Court in W.P.(C) No. 1784/2023 titled as Anand Singh Panwar and Ors v. Union of India & Ors

(b) Direct the Respondents to purge the contempt before they are heard in the matter; and/or

(c) Award cost of the petition in favour of the Petitioner; and/or



(d) Pass any further orders/ directions as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

AND FOR THIS ACT OF KINDNESS THE PETITIONERS ARE DUTY BOUND SHALL EVER PRAY.”

4. Vide order 22.10.2024 in W.P.(C) 1784/2023, the learned Division Bench has given the following directions:-

“5. The learned counsel for the petitioners has drawn our attention to the Order dated 14.08.2024 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, of which one of us (namely Hon'ble Ms. Justice Shalinder Kaur) was a part of the Bench, in W.P.(C) 1022/2023 titled Ajit Singh & Ors vs. Union of India & Ors., where, while considering a similar issue, this Court held as under:

“10. Having considered the submissions of learned counsel for the parties, we are of the view that once the Punjab and Haryana High Court has, in Jagmal Singh (supra,) directed that the benefits of the replacement scale as per recommendations of the 5th CPC ought to be granted to a similar placed BSF personnel w.e.f. 01.01.1996, the respondents cannot refuse to extend the benefits to all similarly placed persons of other CAPFs. No justification has been provided by the respondents for restricting the benefits to the petitioner in the aforesaid decision. Furthermore, the benefits in terms of these directions, as admitted by the learned counsel for the respondents, have also been extended to Force personnel in another CAPF. The petitioners are therefore, justified in claiming that the benefits in terms of the recommendations of the 5th CPC are required to be extended to them from 01.01.1996, the date from which said recommendations have been made effective and also subsequently incorporated in the CCS (revised pay) Rules, 1997. 11. The writ petitions are, accordingly, allowed by directing the respondents to grant the benefit of the replacement



scales as per the recommendations of the 5th CPC to the petitioners w.e.f. 01.01.1996 as against 10.10.1997. However, taking into account the delay on the part of the petitioners in approaching this Court, we direct that though the notional fixation of pay replacement scale be granted to the petitioners w.e.f. 01.01.1996, any consequential arrears on this count will be restricted to a period of three years prior to the date of filing of the respective writ petitions. The exercise in terms of this order will be carried out within a period of three months.”

6. In view of the above Judgment, the present petition is disposed of by directing the respondents to grant similar relief to the petitioners. However, in case the respondents are of the opinion that the petitioners, for any other reason, are not entitled to the same relief, the respondents must pass a speaking order thereon within a period of eight weeks from the receipt of copy of this Order, communicating the reasons thereof to the concerned petitioners. In that event, it shall be open to the said petitioners to challenge the Order passed by the respondents in accordance with law.”

5. Issue notice.
6. Learned counsel for the respondent accepts notice.
7. Let a compliance affidavit be filed before the next date of hearing.
8. In case of non-compliance, the concerned officer shall remain present in Court on the next date of hearing.
9. List on 29.01.2026.

AMIT SHARMA, J

DECEMBER 17, 2025/nk/ah