



\$~8

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 7/2014**

BINU BALA

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Isha Khanna and Mr. Krishan
Kant Sharma, Advocates.

versus

N R BISHNOI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh, Advocate for R-
1 and 2.
Mr. K. Gayatri, Advocate for R-3 and
4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. K. CHAWLA

ORDER

%

17.12.2019

Drawing advertence to para 7 of the reply/objections of December, 2018, Ms. Khanna, learned counsel for the petitioner strenuously contends that even though the petitioner was granted 50% of the back wages, when her termination was held to be bad in law, the petitioner could not be denied the consequential increments, ACP and other financial benefits accruing to her by virtue of V, VII and VII Pay Commissions.

Let the respondents file a specific affidavit giving reasons for denial of such financial benefits taking note of the fact that the termination of the petitioner was held bad in law.

A fresh decision on the aspect, if required, be taken within four weeks and status thereof be also furnished in the affidavit to be so filed.

At this stage, Ms. Khanna, learned counsel for the petitioner expresses



apprehension that the respondents seek to remit the salaries due to the petitioner electronically in the account instead of by way of cheque, and that any such remittance shall prejudice the rights and contentions of the petitioner. It is, therefore, made clear that any remittances to be made by the respondents directly to the account of the petitioner shall not prejudice any rights and contentions of the petitioner.

List on 14.05.2020.

DECEMBER 17, 2019
AK

A. K. CHAWLA, J