



\$~1 (special bench)

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

+ W.P.(C) 13010/2022

VINAY KUMAR SIDH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, Mr. Manas Verma, Ms. Kritika Matta, Advs.

versus

THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Ms. Laavanya Kaushik, Adv. for Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, Standing Counsel, GNCTD (Services)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

16.08.2024

%

CM APPL. 8987/2024

1. This is an application filed by the petitioner under Section 151 CPC seeking clarification of the order dated 17.11.2022 vide which the present writ petition was disposed of alongwith a batch of writ petitions by directing the respondents to extend the benefits of this Court's decision dated 03.08.2021 passed in W.P.(C) 11154/2019 titled "*Janardan Sharma vs. GNCT of Delhi through it's Chief Secretary & Ors.*" to the petitioners.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even though the writ petition in *Janardan Sharma* (supra) was allowed by directing the respondents to pay the due gratuity to the petitioner therein with interest computed @6% p.a. as also costs of Rs 20,000/-, the respondents while releasing the gratuity in terms of this Court's order dated 17.11.2022 have neither paid interest nor paid costs to the



petitioner.

3. Issue notice. Ms. Laavanya Kaushik accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that no interest or costs were paid to the petitioners as no specific directions in this regard were issued by this Court on 17.11.2022.
4. Having considered the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and perused the order dated 17.11.2022, I find absolutely no merit in the respondents' plea. Once it is the common case of the parties that the present writ petition was disposed of with directions to the respondents to extend the same benefits to the petitioner in the present case as were granted to the petitioner in *Janardan Sharma (supra)*, the respondents were bound to extend all the benefits extended in *Janardan Sharma (supra)*, which decision admittedly stands implemented.
5. In these circumstances, the petitioner would also be entitled to interest @6% per annum as well as costs of Rs. 20,000 as were awarded to the petitioner in *Janardan Sharma (surpa)*.
6. The application is, therefore, allowed by making it clear that the respondents are liable to pay to the petitioner, costs of Rs.20,000/- and interest @6 % per annum on the amount of gratuity.

REKHA PALLI, J

AUGUST 16, 2024

acm