



\$~5 &6

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

+ CONT.CAS(C) 382/2017 and CM APPs. 43548/2017, 39991/2021,
15398/2022, 15856/2022

IQBAL SINGH VEDI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Malaya Kumar Chand, Adv.

versus

D S BHULLER & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Ms.Anjana Gosain, Ms.Shalini Nair
and Ms.Ritika Khanagwal, Advs.

+ CONT.CAS(C) 435/2017 and CM APPLs. 29100/2017, 39990/2021

IQBAL SINGH VEDI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Malaya Kumar Chand, Adv.

versus

D S BHULLER & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Ms.Anjana Gosain, Ms.Shalini Nair
and Ms.Ritika Khanagwal, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

05.07.2022

%

1. Vide paragraph 6 of the order/judgment dated 06.03.2017, a Division Bench of this Court had directed as under:-

“6. As a consequence, the order of the Tribunal dated



18.12.2014 is set- aside with the directions that the respondents shall revise the pension of the petitioner on implementation of 6th Central Pay Commission w.e.f. 01.01.2006 keeping in view the directions of this court in W.P. (C) No.5687/2007 decided today. The pension so revised w.e.f. 01.01.1996 shall be subject to adjustment and if the excess amount is found to have been paid to the petitioner shall be adjustable from the pension payable hereinafter and if on such revision of pension w.e.f. 01.01.2006 the amount is found payable to the petitioner, the same shall be paid by the respondent within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the order”

2. The present contempt petitions have been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the aforesaid directions. However, it is noticed that the Division Bench itself observed, that if any excess amount is found to have been paid to the petitioner, the same is required to be adjusted. In this Context, on 29.03.2022, this court had also taken note of the submission made by the learned counsel for respondent No. 1 that unless respondent No. 4/Bank furnishes the details of total pension disbursed to the petitioner till date, it would not be possible to undertake the exercise contemplated in the order dated 06.03.2017.

3. It appears that respondent no.4/Bank has not been served as the process fee filed by the petitioner is lying under objection. This is a grave lapse on the part of the petitioner since proceedings have been deferred time and again to enable the petitioner to serve the Bank and on the last date, this Court was also constrained to impose costs on the petitioner.

4. In the interest of justice, let fresh notice be issued to the respondent No.4/Bank through all modes including *WhatsApp*, email and dasti in addition. Let respondent No.4/Bank be also served through the nominated



counsel.

5. It is also pointed out by Ms. Anjana Gosain that vide Diary No. 454758 respondent No.1 has filed reply to the short affidavit setting out the entitlement of the petitioner. Let the same be also placed on record before the next date of hearing.

6. List on 20.12.2022.

SACHIN DATTA, J

JULY 5, 2022

rb