



\$~16

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

+ **W.P.(C) 11117/2016**

SHRI RAVI PRAKASH & ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sudhir Vats, Advocate with
Petitioner in person.

versus

CENTRAL WAREHOUSING CORPORATIONRespondent

Through: Mr. K. K. Tyagi, Mr. Iftexhar Ahmad
and Ms. Garima Tyagi, Advocates for
CWC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
24.02.2026

%

1. During the course of submissions, it has been noted that the Government of India, Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution, by order dated 29th June, 2012, while informing the Central Warehousing Corporation (“CWC”) that the DPE had expressed negative views on the issue of removal of anomalies/stagnation, and made a suggestion as follows:

*“Subject: Removal of anomalies/stagnation in revised pay scales
w.e.f. 01.01.2007 in respect of Group C & D employees - regarding*

Sir,

I am directed to refer to CWC’s letter no. CWC/IRO-Wage Implementation/2009 dated 23rd June, 2011 and 21st September, 2011 on the above subject and to say that on CWC’s request, the matter was again taken up with DPE. They have, however, stated that DPE had already given their views on the issue of removal of anomalies/stagnation and increasing the span of scales of pay of workmen in CWC.



2. *The DPE has further stated that wage revision in respect of workmen is to be done as per the policy laid down by DPE and falls within the purview of the CPSE and its administrative Ministry. The Integrated Finance Division of this Department has been consulted in the matter. They have expressed their inability to concur to the proposal of the CWC to remove anomalies/stagnation in respect of certain grades/scales of Group C & D employees of CWC since it is not in conformity to the DPE guidelines. They have, however, suggested to examine whether the issue regarding anomalies/stagnation may be resolved by granting stagnation increment instead of increasing the span of the pay scales.*

3. *CWC may please consider the suggestion and send a revised proposal accordingly for consideration of the Department.”*

[Emphasis supplied]

2. Accordingly, the Court has called upon Mr. K. K. Tyagi, counsel appearing for the CWC, to confirm whether any decision has been taken pursuant to the aforesaid suggestion for granting a “*stagnation increment*” to the Petitioners. He seeks a short accommodation to take instructions.

3. Re-notify on 30th April, 2026.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

FEBRUARY 24, 2026/hc