

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**I.A. NO. 163382 OF 2025  
IN SLP (CIVIL) NO.....OF 2025  
(@ DIARY NO. 51829 OF 2024)**

**UNION OF INDIA & ORS.**

**...PETITIONER(S)**

**VERSUS**

**ROOP RAM PIPPAL**

**...RESPONDENT**

**O R D E R**

1. This Interlocutory Application is filed by the sole respondent (Roop Ram Pippal) in SLP(C) Diary No. 51829 of 2024, seeking the following prayers:

- (i) Direct Petitioners to release/disburse pensionary benefits due and payable to the applicant/respondent since his date of retirement i.e. 31.05.2005, along with applicable DA, without any deductions, and in terms of CAT Order dated 23.01.2018, till date; and/or
- (ii) Direct the Petitioners to issue necessary instructions to concerned disbursing bank to disburse the pensionary benefits due and payable to the applicant/respondent, as revised in terms of 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission along with the additional pension/family pension payable on

attaining the age of 80 years as well as applicable dearness allowance/relief, along with all arrears since his date of retirement i.e. 31.05.2005; and

- (iii) Quash the direction issued by the Senior Divisional Finance Manager Izzatnagar, North Eastern Railway vide Letters dated 03.11.2022 and 14.12.2022 directing recovery of excess pension from applicant's account, and directing repayment of amounts already deducted in connection with the said recovery already undertaken;
  - (iv) Pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.
2. The present SLP has been preferred by the Union of India against the judgment of the High Court of Allahabad dated 17.01.2024 dismissing its writ petition and affirming the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal<sup>1</sup> dated 23.01.2018 in O.A. No. 1640 of 2011, whereby the CAT allowed the respondent-applicant's original application.
3. Briefly stated, the respondent-applicant, a Station Master, was charge-sheeted on 01.01.2001. An inquiry was held; the report dated 11.05.2005 found the charges proved. By then, he had retired on superannuation. The Disciplinary

---

1 In short, 'CAT'

Authority, after obtaining UPSC advice dated 02.11.2010, imposed the penalty vide order dated 16.12.2010 with a consequential order dated 28.03.2011 reducing his monthly pension to ₹3,500/- permanently, with gratuity to be released. The respondent-applicant challenged the orders before the CAT on the ground, inter alia, that the UPSC advice was not supplied to him. The CAT quashed the punishment and remitted the matter to the Disciplinary Authority with directions to supply the inquiry report and UPSC advice and conclude the proceedings afresh. The Union of India's writ petition assailing the order of CAT was dismissed by the High Court, *vide* the impugned order, leading to the present SLP.

4. We have heard Mr. Amit Pawan, learned counsel for the respondent-applicant and Mr. S.D. Sanjay, learned ASG appearing for the Union of India.
5. The respondent-applicant submits that, even on the original penalty, he is entitled to minimum pension with dearness relief; however, both have been stopped, and he is receiving only about ₹1,900/- per month. Further recovery orders have also been issued and consequent thereto deductions have been made from the applicants' Bank Account.

6. This Court issued notice in the present SLP on 10.12.2024. No interim order has been passed by this Court staying disbursement of the respondent-applicant's pensionary benefits.
7. By order dated 23.01.2018, the CAT quashed the punishment orders dated 16.12.2010 and 28.03.2011 and remitted the matter to the Disciplinary Authority after directing supply of the inquiry report and UPSC advice. Consequently, as on date, no punishment order operates against the respondent-applicant. The Union of India's writ petition against the CAT order was dismissed; the present SLP assails that dismissal.
8. Having regard to (a) the respondent-applicant's advanced age and length of service; (b) the long pendency of the disciplinary proceedings and litigation; (c) the absence of any interim order of this Court restraining payment of pensionary benefits; (d) the fact that the punishment stands quashed by the CAT and no fresh decision has yet been taken; and (e) that, even on the original penalty, the respondent-applicant would be entitled at least to the minimum pension with dearness relief, we consider it just and proper to grant interim relief during the pendency of these proceedings.
9. Accordingly, without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties and subject to the outcome of

the SLP, we direct that the respondent-applicant be entitled to the relief as prayed in the present application with the only rider that the respondent-applicant would be entitled to the benefit of Seventh Pay Commission if other similarly situate employees have been extended the same.

10. In the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the Interlocutory Application being I.A. No.163382/2025 is allowed as prayed in the light of observations made above.

..... **J.**  
**[VIKRAM NATH]**

..... **J.**  
**[SANDEEP MEHTA]**

**NEW DELHI;**  
**OCTOBER 14, 2025.**

ITEM NO.7

COURT NO.3

SECTION XI-B

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 8878/2016  
[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated  
07.12.2015 in LPA No. 214/2013 passed by the High Court of  
Jammu & Kashmir and Ladakh at Srinagar]

ANIL VYAS

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.  
WITH

Respondent(s)

Diary No(s). 51829/2024 (XI)  
(ONLY IA No. 163382/2025 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS IN  
D.No. 51829/2024 IS LISTED

Date : 14-10-2025      This appln. was called  
on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM NATH  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MEHTA

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. S.D.Sanjay, A.S.G.  
Mr. Amitesh Mishra, Adv.  
Mr. Udit Dedhiya, Adv.  
Mr. Madhav Sinhal, Adv.  
Mr. Vijay Awana, Adv.  
Mr. Annirudh Sharma-ii, Adv.  
Mr. Ishaan Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. Shashank Bajpai, Adv.  
Mr. Chitvan Singhal, Adv.  
Mr. Raman Yadav, Adv.  
Mr. Abhishek Kumar Pandey, Adv.  
Mr. Kartikay Aggarwal, Adv.  
Ms. Ameyavikrama Thanvi, Adv.  
Mr. Amrish Kumar, AOR  
Mr. Khushal Kolwat, Adv.  
Mr. Shubham Prakash Mishra, Adv.  
Mr. Vijay Awana, Adv.  
Mr. Shubh Shrama, Adv.

Mr. Venkita Subramoniam T.R, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Amit Pawan, AOR

Mr. K.M.Nataraj, A.S.G.  
Mr. Vinayak Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. Padmesh Mishra, Adv.  
Mr. Yuvraj Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. Digvijay Dam, Adv.  
Ms. Preeti Rani, Adv.  
Mr. Kartikay Aggarwal, Adv.  
Mr. Shashank Bajpai, Adv.  
Ms. Ameyavikrama Thanvi, Adv.  
Mr. Abhishek Kumar Paney, Adv.  
Mr. Chitvan Singhal, Adv.  
Mr. Raman Yadav, Adv.  
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AOR

Ms. Sushma Suri, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

I.A. No. 163382/2025 in Diary

No.51829/2024 is allowed in terms of the signed  
order.

(NEETU KHAJURIA)  
ASST.REGISTRAR-CUM-PS

(RANJANA SHAILEY)  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(Signed order in I.A. No.163382/2025 is placed on the file.)