



\$~1 (SB)

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 10994/2016
SATYA PAL

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shanker Raju, Adv.

versus

**CHAIRMAN CUM MANAGING DIRECTOR, DELHI
TRANSPORT CORPORATION** Respondent

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC, (DTC)
with Mrs. Taniya Ahlawat,
Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh,
Ms. Laavanya Kaushik, Ms. Aliza
Alam and Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat,
Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **24.11.2023**

REVIEW PET. 327/2023

1. We have seen the review petition filed by the petitioner. The only submission of Mr. Shanker Raju, appearing on behalf of the review petitioner is that the petitioner, effective from April 25, 1982 having been brought on monthly rates, the period thereafter need to be counted (excluding 501 days) for computing his qualifying service for the purpose of grant of pension.

2. Perusal of paragraph 15 of the judgment of which review is being sought, would reveal that it is the case of the petitioner that period post April 25, 1982 to May 31, 1993, excluding 501 days which period is 1 year 4



months 16 days need to be excluded for the purpose of determining the qualifying service and he in all has put in 9 years 8 months 20 days of eligible service, which shows the same being less than 9 years and 9 months, we have rightly held that the order of the Tribunal does not require any interference.

4. We are of the view that no ground for review is made out. The review petition is dismissed as such. No cost.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

NOVEMBER 24, 2023/jg