



2024:DHC:8215



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

% **Judgment reserved on : 02 September 2024**
Judgment pronounced on: 23 October 2024

+ CONT.CAS(C) 204/2019

CIVIL AND SESSIONS COURT STENOGRAPHERS
ASSOCIATION (REGD) & ANRPetitioners

Through: Mr. Rajat Aneja, Ms.
Chandrika Gupta and Ms.
Alka Dwivedi, Advs.

versus

SHRI VIJAY KUMAR DEVRespondent

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat,
Standing counsel for GNCTD
(Services) with Mr.Nitesh
Kumar Singh, Ms. Laavanya
Kaushik, Ms. Aliza Alam and
Mr. Mohnish Sehrawat, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DHARMESH SHARMA

J U D G M E N T

1. The petitioner No. 1, an association of Stenographers working in the Delhi District Courts, has preferred this petition through its President, along with petitioner No. 2, who is serving as a Stenographer in the Delhi District Courts, seeking initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondent/Chief Secretary for the alleged wilful and contumacious disobedience of the directions of this Court as contained in the judgement dated 09.07.2015, passed in W.P.(C) No.5392/2011.



2. Briefly stated, the genesis of the dispute emanates from the judgment dated 02.05.2008 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in case titled **Mirza Zahid Beg & Ors. v. Union of India**¹, wherein it was directed that the LDCs² employed in the District Courts of Delhi should be granted parity with the LDCs working/employed in the High Court, with effect from 01.01.1996. Evidently, the aforesaid direction resulted in certain anomalies upon implementation, as the LDCs began receiving much higher salaries than the UDCs³.

3. The conundrum led to a spate of writ petitions being instituted in this Court between 2011 to 2012 by the petitioners who were working in various District Courts in Delhi as Process Servers⁴, Stenographers⁵, Peons/orderlies/dak peons and Drivers⁶, which were clubbed together for hearing. Suffice to state that a short issue that was addressed in the aforesaid writ petitions was the determination of arrears of enhanced salary and other financial benefits to the petitioners with effect from 01.01.1996 until the Delhi District Courts Establishment (Appointment & Conditions of Service) Rules, 2012 [**“Establishment Rules”**] came into force on 02.12.2013.

4. At this juncture it would be pertinent to refer to the observations made by the Division Bench of this Court in W.P.(C) No.5392/2011. *vide* order dated 17.02.2012, which are as follows:

"We may also point out that there are many serious anomalies which need to be corrected in view of the decision in Mirza Zahid

¹ W.P.(C) 484/1988

² Lower Division Clerks

³ Upper Division Clerks

⁴ W.P.(C) 496/2011

⁵ W.P.(C) 5392/2011

⁶ W.P.(C)5394/2011



Beg. An illustration of such an anomaly is that the Stenographers and the Upper Division Clerics are getting lower salaries than the Lower Division Clerics, though both of them are higher to LDCs and were earlier getting higher pays. There are similar anomalies in the sense that people doing the same work are not being paid equally. It is for this reason that there is urgency in this matter and the directions have been issued keeping this in mind.”

5. In the said backdrop, the Division Bench passed certain final directions *vide* judgment dated 09.07.2015, the operative portion of which provided as under: -

“Learned counsel for the parties submit that the Only issue which now requires consideration is the payment of arrears. Learned counsel for the petitioners on instructions from the petitioners also submits that in case the arrears are released, they would forego the interest on the amount. It is further submitted that pay scales of all three categories of personnel i.e. Stenographers, Process Servers and Drivers, who are before this Court, are higher or equivalent to the pay scale of Lower Division Clerks and since the Lower Division Clerks have been granted benefit since 01.01.1996, the same benefit should be granted to them.

Learned counsel for Group-D Employees being Peons/Orderlies and Dak Peons in W. P. (C) 5085/2011 submits that Group-D employees would also be entitled to the aforesaid benefit since 01.01.1996 on the basis of parity.

Learned counsel appearing for Delhi Government is unable to show any reason as to why persons who are placed either equivalent to Lower Division Clerks or higher can be deprived of the benefit since 01.01.1996 when such benefit was granted to Lower Division Clerks.

The Delhi Government is directed to grant the same benefits to Stenographers in W. P.(C) 5392/2011, Process Servers in W.P.(C) 4964/2011, Drivers in W.P.(C) 5394/2011 and Peons/Orderlies and Dak Peons in W. P. (C) 5085/2011 as granted to Low Division Clerks from 01.01.1996.

Learned counsel for Delhi Government submits that Government is unable to consider the request of the petitioners as they have not received any such proposal.

It is directed that Respondent No.1 will make a proposal to the Delhi Government within one month and Delhi Government will consider the same in the light of the judgment passed by this Court, within three months, as prayed.

In view of the fact that Delhi District Courts Establishment



(appointment and, Conditions of Service) Rules, 2012 have been framed by the High Court of Delhi, the petitioners and similarly situate persons shall be entitled to the revised pay scale. Delhi Government shall pay the salary to the petitioners and similarly situate persons, from the month of August, 2015 onwards as per revised pay scale.

Petitions stand disposed of.”

6. Aggrieved thereof, the respondent/GNCTD⁷ preferred a Special Leave Petition⁸ before the Supreme Court, which was dismissed *vide* order dated 09.02.2011. Since the employees in the aforesaid posts in the District Courts were not paid the arrears, they preferred a bunch of contempt cases⁹, which were decided by this Court *vide* order dated 07.03.2017. It would be relevant to reproduce the said order, which provided as follows: -

“1. In pursuance to the last order, Mr. Siddharth Luthra, learned Senior Advocate along with Mr. Gaurav Sarin, Advocate enters appearance on behalf of the Secretary to Lt. Governor of Delhi. Mr. Luthra has shown the file pertaining to this case.

2. A perusal of the file reveals that the Principal Secretary (Finance), Govt. of NCT of Delhi on 29th August, 2016 had opined that since the effective date of Delhi District Courts Establishment (Appointment & Conditions of Service) Rules, 2012 [for short “Rules, 2012”] is 2nd December, 2013, the approval of the Competent Authority to make the Rules, 2012 effective from 1st January, 1996 to Stenographers, Process Servers, Drivers, Orderly, Peons and Dak Peons in accordance with Division Bench judgment would be required. Mr. Luthra, states that the Notification dated 2nd December, 2013 had been issued with prior approval of the Central Government (Ministry of Home Affairs) of employees of District Courts.

3. He further states that the Notification dated 28th October, 1953 states that prior approval of the Central Government is required before coming into force of rules relating to service conditions of employees of District Courts.

4. On the other hand, Mr. Pawanjit S. Bindra, learned counsel for petitioners states that the present case does not require

⁷ Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi

⁸ SLP (Civil) 24766/08

⁹ Contempt Cases No.1023, 1026, 1027 & 1028/2015



amendment of any rules as the Division Bench vide its judgment and order dated 9th July, 2015 has granted parity to the petitioners with Lower Division Clerks from 1st January, 1996. He further states that when the Lower Division Clerks were granted parity with the Delhi High Court employees, no prior sanction of the Central Government had been obtained. Mr. Gaurav Sarin, in rejoinder, states that in view of the dismissal of the SLP filed by the Govt. of NCT of Delhi, the Lower Division Clerks were granted parity with the Delhi High Court employees without taking prior approval of the Central Government, Ministry of Home Affairs.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the view that as the Division Bench vide its judgment and order dated 9th July, 2015 has applied the principle of parity and directed the Delhi Government to grant the same benefits to the Stenographers, Process Servers, Drivers, Orderly, Peons and Dak Peons as granted to the Lower Division Clerks from 1st January, 1996, no amendment of Rules, 2012 is required. In fact, if the amendment of Rules, 2012 was a pre-requisite, as suggested by Mr. Luthra, then this Court has no doubt that the Division Bench order would have been challenged by the respondents as being contrary to law.

6. However, as the Division Bench's order dated 9th July, 2015 has attained finality, this Court is of the view that it needs to be complied with immediately. This Court is further of the view that reference of the file by the Lt. Governor is an exercise in futility as no official of the Ministry of Home Affairs can sit in appeal over the judgment and order of the Division Bench and take a stand that it shall not comply with the same or refuse to amend the rules. At the highest, the amendment of the rules is a procedural requirement which can even be obtained post facto. However, the said approval cannot be the basis to hold up disbursement of funds in accordance with the Division Bench order dated 9th July, 2015.

7. Moreover, once the Union of India through the Ministry of Law and Justice had taken the stand in the writ petition that it was neither necessary nor appropriate party as Union of India had not to bear any financial burden and the petitioners were not its employees, the reference of the file to Union of India could have been made only with the prior approval of the Division Bench.

8. Also the stand taken by the Union of India through Ministry of Law and Justice cannot be said to be a stand of a particular Ministry. It reflects the stand of the Union of India. If there was a mistake or a miscommunication, Ministry of Law and Justice, Union of India should have brought it to the notice of the Division Bench and withdrawn its earlier affidavit.



9. Keeping in view the aforesaid as well as the fact that the budgets are going to lapse by 31st March, 2017, this Court directs the District & Sessions Judge (HQ) to release the amounts to the petitioners in accordance with the judgment and order dated 9th July, 2015 within two weeks.

10. With the aforesaid direction, present contempt petitions are closed. It is clarified that there is no requirement for Secretary to Lt. Governor of Delhi to place on record any affidavit.”

7. To cut the long story short, what transpires is that although arrears were disbursed to all entitled parties in terms of the order dated 07.03.2017, the Stenographers Grade-I and Grade-II were inadvertently left out of the reckoning, as the Establishment in the Office of the District & Sessions Judge only upgraded the pay scale of Stenographer Grade-III and not the Stenographer Grade-II and Grade-I. Instead, it merged the pay scale of Stenographer Grade-II with Stenographer Grade-III, effective from 01.01.1996.

8. It appears that pursuant to the directions *vide* judgement dated 09.07.2015, the issues were deliberated in the meeting convened by the learned D&SJ(HQ)¹⁰ for its implementation, and on meticulous perusal of the minutes which were drawn on 19.08.2015, it was revealed that an oversight occurred as Stenographers (Grade-II) and Stenographers (Grade-I) were not accorded the enhanced revised pay scales at par with their counterparts in the High Court. It would be relevant to reproduce the exact extracts of the minutes dated 19.08.2015, whereby the revised pay scales as per Swamy’s Revised Pay Rules, 2008 were determined or laid down as on 01.01.1996 and 01.01.2006, which are as under:

¹⁰ District and Sessions Judge (Head Quarters)



Posts	Existing Pay Scale/Pay Band as on 01/01/96 & 01/01/06		Corresponding revised Pay Scale/Pay Band as on 01/01/96 & 01/01/06 based on Recruitment Rules, 2012 (notified on 02/12/13)	
Personal Assistant/Stenographer Grade III	01/01/1996	4000-6000	01/01/1996	5500-9000
	01/01/2006	5200-20200 (GP-2400)	01/01/2006	9300-34800 (GP-4200)
Personal Assistant/Stenographer Grade II	01/01/1996	5000-8000	01/01/1996	5500-9000
	01/01/2006	9300-34800 (GP-4200)	01/01/2006	9300-34800 (GP-4200)
Sr. Personal Assistant Grade-I	01/01/1996	6500-10500	01/01/1996	6500-10500
	01/01/2006	9300-34800 (GP - 4600)	01/01/2006	9300-34800 (GP- 4600)

Note:- The table pertaining to peon/orderly/dak peons, driver & process server omitted as not relevant.

9. The said *imbroglio* led to filing of representations by the aggrieved Stenographers on 07.06.2017. Pursuant to which, a one-member committee, chaired by Dr. Kamini Lau, the then learned AD&SJ¹¹, was constituted, and she submitted her report on 25.08.2017, which was duly approved by the then learned D&SJ (HQ) on 28.08.2017. However, surprisingly, the approval was recalled on 31.08.2017 on the premise that the matter required approval from the High Court.

10. The proposal for approval of the aforesaid minutes was then sent *vide* letter reference dated 04.09.2017, which reached the desk of the Registrar General of this Court. Subsequently, Mr. Reetesh Singh, Joint Registrar (Rules) of the High Court of Delhi, an officer from the cadre

¹¹ Additional District & Sessions Judge



of DHJS¹² on deputation, prepared a detailed note seeking approval from the High Court of Delhi on the administrative side and as per the directions of the Hon'ble the then Chief Justice, the said note came to be approved on 04.07.2018 by Hon'ble Mr. Justice C. Hari Shankar, Judge, High Court of Delhi, and later endorsed by Hon'ble The Acting Chief Justice *vide* letter dated 11.07.2018.

11. The record shows that the learned D&SJ (HQ) subsequently issued an administrative order dated 13.07.2018, thereby revising and upgrading the pay scales of Stenographer Grade-II from Rs. 5,000-8,000/- to Rs. 6,500-10,500/- and Stenographer Grade-I from Rs. 6,500-10,500/ to Rs. 10,000-15,200/-, with retrospective effect from 01.01.1996. This aligned their pay scales with those of Senior Personal Assistant and Private Secretaries working in the High Court of Delhi.

THE MOOT POINT: SHORT ISSUE

12. **Although the enhanced salaries have been disbursed by the respondent since August 2018, the only issue that remains for now is the disbursement of the arrears from 1996 until July, 2018.**

13. Going back little in time, following the approval accorded by Hon'ble the then Acting Chief Justice *vide* letter dated 11.07.2018, the then learned D&SJ (HQ) took up the matter with the respondent/GNCTD seeking financial sanction for release of the arrears. To cut the long story, there were a spate of correspondence exchanged between the office of the D&SJ (HQ) and the Finance department of the GNCTD. However, the matter still remained *in limbo*, and hence, the present contempt petition was instituted on

¹² Delhi High Judicial Services



11.03.2019.

LEGAL SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS:

14. Mr. Rajat Aneja, learned counsel for the petitioners' Association, vehemently urged that the directions contained in the order dated 09.07.2015 passed in W.P. (C) No. 5392/2011 with regard to upgradation of pay scales of Stenographers viz., Grade-II and Grade-I are yet to be implemented, and thereby, depriving the petitioners the benefit of already earned promotion. Mr. Aneja alluded to the report of Ms. Kamini Lau, learned AD&SJ dated 25.08.2017 and also note prepared by Mr. Reetesh Singh, Joint Registrar (Rules) laid before the Hon'ble Judge of the High Court of Delhi on 04.07.2018, and approved by the then Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice, Delhi High Court on 11.07.2018 and it was urged that issues raised by the Stenographers were not only approved but very quite eruditely bringing to the fore that their pay scales are yet to be upgraded for the period 01.01.1996 to July, 2018.

15. *Per contra*, Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent, urged that petitioners are now raising new issues that were not part of the original order, and it was vehemently urged that the present contempt petition is based on a fresh cause of action. It was pointed out that, pursuant to the dismissal of Special Leave Petition by the Supreme Court *vide* judgment dated 02.05.2008, the Law Department, GNCTD sanctioned a sum of Rs. 79,20,80,069/- for the revision of pay scales. Eventually, in terms of the letter dated 07.08.2015, the then learned D&SJ (HQ) submitted a financial implication/budget proposal tentative for the period prior to the



notification effective from 01.01.1996. Based on the aforesaid estimates, arrears from 01.01.1996 were stated to be Rs. 150,53,19,300/-, which financial proposal was eventually sanctioned by the Council of Ministers on 17.08.2016 *vide* decision No. 2406 dated 17.08.2016. Accordingly, an administrative approval was communicated to the learned D&SJ (HQ) *vide* letter dated 10.03.2017 and the matter stood closed from the end of the respondent/GNCTD.

16. In the said background, it was urged that the representations which have been preferred by the petitioners cannot be accepted, as doing so would amount to re-inventing the entire wheel, and such issues cannot be brought within the scope and ambit of the contempt proceedings. In support of her submissions, learned Standing Counsel has relied on decisions in **J.S. Parihar v. Ganapati Duggar**¹³; **Union of India v. Subedar Devassy PV**¹⁴; **Anil Kumar Sahi v. Prof. Ram Sewak Yadav**¹⁵; **Sudhir Vasudeva v. M. George Ravishekar**¹⁶; **K. Arumugam v. V. Balakrishnan**¹⁷; and **Secretary Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board (DSSSB) v. Ranveer Singh**¹⁸.

ANALYSIS & DECISION:

17. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions advanced by the learned counsels for the parties at the Bar. I have gone through the relevant record of this case and also the written

¹³ (1996) 6 SCC 291

¹⁴ (2006) 1 SCC 613

¹⁵ (2008) 14 SCC 613

¹⁶ (2014) 14 SCC 115

¹⁷ (2019) 18 SCC 150

¹⁸ LPA 80/2021 dated 18.01.2022



submissions besides the case law placed on the record.

18. First things first, the legal position that emerges subsequent to directions dated 09.07.2015 passed by this Court and as clarified in the aforesaid contempt proceedings *vide* order dated 07.03.2017 are as follows:

“Firstly, the employees/staff of the Delhi District Courts were accorded parity in terms of their service conditions with their equivalent counterparts working/serving in the Establishment of High Court w.e.f. 01.01.1996.

Secondly, with the coming into force of the **Establishment Rules w.e.f. 02.12.2013**, the anomalies in the service conditions of employees in the District Courts vis-à-vis their counterparts in the High Court of Delhi were addressed. There is no dispute that, thereafter, employees/staff of the Delhi District Courts have been paid salaries and other financial benefits in accordance with the parity established with the employees/staff serving/working in the High Court Establishment.

Thirdly, insofar as the petitioners, who are falling in Stenographer Grade-II & I are concerned, their grievance is that their pay scales have not been upgraded w.e.f. 01.01.1996 till July, 2018, which still needs to be addressed.

19. However, insofar as the aforesaid point No.3 is concerned, the plea of the respondent/GNCTD seems to be that they have already paid the entire arrears for the period in question, as indicated by the financial sanction accorded *vide* letter dated 23.03.2017, which authorized a sum of Rs. 1,77,84,53,000/- although *vide* letter dated 07.08.2015 from the Office of the D&SJ(HQ) only Rs. 150,43,10,330/- were demanded.



20. Unhesitatingly, the respondent/GNCTD has completely misconstrued the entirety of the issues at hand and has rejected the request by the learned D&SJ(HQ) in a mechanical, arbitrary and deliberate manner. No estoppel is created against the petitioners regarding the anomalous situation that arose due to an oversight in minutes of meeting dated 19.08.2015 and subsequently for not providing accurate estimates by the office of D&SJ(HQ) to the respondent. In an organization with more than seven thousand employees, who are working in various cadres in the District Courts in Delhi, situations may arise where some aspects of the salaries or other benefits are not accurately assessed. It happens all the time.

21. Our experience in administrative matters shows that there have been umpteen numbers of instances where fixation and upgradation of pay scales and financial benefits were found to be deficient due to inadvertent miscalculations or oversight. There are also instances in the service law & practices where on many occasions even excess payments have been made, which are eventually recovered from the employees on audit objections or otherwise.

22. Reverting back to the instant matter, merely because there was some administrative oversight on the part of the Office of D&SJ (HQ), that would by itself not efface the legal right of the petitioners to seek equality in service conditions. Evidently, the whole issue is very lucidly espoused in the detailed representation by Ms. Kaveri Baweja, an officer of DHJS that explains the entire background and the manner in which the issue of upgradation of pay scales of the members of the petitioners' Association falling in the Grade-II & Grade-I with their



counterparts working in High Court of Delhi have to be equated on or after 01.01.1996. It would be relevant to extract the representation which goes as under:

“4. Since in the light of above order dated 09.07.2015 the arrears of salary w.e.f. 01.01.1996 were not disbursed to the Stenographers, they had preferred a Contempt Petition bearing Cont. Case (C) 1026/2015, Civil & Sessions Court Stenographers Association (Regd.) & Ors. Vs. Kewal Kumar Sharma & Anr. Vide order dated 07.03.2017 passed in above Contempt Petition, the Hon'ble High Court has been pleased to direct the District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi to release the amounts to Stenographers in accordance with the judgment and order dated 09.07.2015 within two weeks.

5. Surprisingly, on receipt of the arrears, it has come to the notice of Stenographers that they have not been disbursed the arrears in accordance with the above judgment and order dated 09.07.2015. **Admittedly, Stenographer Grade-III has been given the pre-revised pay scale-of Rs.5500-9000 w.e.f. 01.01.1996, but so far as Stenographer Grade-II and Stenographer Grade-I are concerned, they have not been given the pre-revised pay scale of Rs.6500-10500 and 10000-15200 respectively, as enjoyed by Senior Personal Assistant and Private Secretary in Delhi High Court on or after 01.01.1996.**

6. **The aforesaid orders have been complied with in piecemeal arbitrarily and irrationally by giving the benefits only to Stenographer Grade-III.** Conversely, the above order dated 09.07.2015 ordains about extending the benefits to 'Stenographers' which undoubtedly includes all the three Grades of Stenographers. As such, the above orders dated 09.07.2015 and 07.03.2017 have in fact not complied with wholesomely in letter and spirit.

7. It appears that an attempt has been made by, the office of your goodself to implement the Delhi District Courts Establishment (Appointment & Conditions of Service) Rules 2012 retrospectively, i.e. 01.01.1996. Rather, it is held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its various pronouncements that Recruitment Rules cannot be implemented retrospectively. In fact, the literal interpretation of the above orders dated 09.07.2015 and 07.03.2017 clearly stipulates that the same benefits are to be given to Stenographers which include Stenographer Grade-III, Grade-II and Grade-I as granted to LDCs from 01.01.1996 and not the revised pay scale which are embodied in the Rules, 2012 as the said Rules are strictly to be enforced - either w.e.f. 02.12.2013 (i.e. the date of



its publication) or from August, 2015 as directed in above order dated 09.07.2015 itself.

8. As such, the pay scales enumerated below may kindly be given w.e.f. 01.01.1996 since by virtue of above order dated 09.07.2015 parity has already been established between Stenographer Grade-III and PA, Stenographer Grade-II and Sr. PA and Stenographer Grade-I and PS working in Delhi High Court so that the above orders may be complied with in letter in spirit:

Name of Post	Previous Scales	From 01.01.1996 to 31.12.2005	From 01.01.2006 to 01.12.2013
Stenographer Grade III	4000-6000	5500-9000	PB-2, 9300-34800 GP 4600
Stenographer Grade II	5000-8000	6500-10500	PB-2, 9300-34800 G.P. 4800
Stenographer Grade I	6500-10500	10000-15200	PB-3, 15600-39100 G.P. 6600

{bold portions emphasized}

23. The aforesaid letter leaves no *iota* of doubt that 549 [**“E&OE”**]¹⁹ number of Stenographers falling in Grade-I and Grade-II, have not been paid the arrears for the period in question. It goes without saying that the Office of D&SJ (HQ) brought the said facts to notice of the respondent/GNCTD time and again and it is really dismaying that despite the said administrative note having been approved by the then Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice, High Court of Delhi on 04.09.2017, all requests and reminders have turned to the deaf ears of the respondent/GNCTD.

24. At the end, the case laws cited by the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent/GNCTD have no bearing on the matters in issue. There is no merit in the plea that a new cause of action has been

¹⁹ Errors and omissions excepted



flawed. Once it is acknowledged and accepted that the Stenographers falling in Grade-II and Grade-I have to be accorded parity with their counterparts working in the High Court of Delhi, and entitled to enhanced pay scales which have to be revised from 01.01.1996 to 31.07.2018, the principle of constructive *res judicata* applies that would debar the respondent/GNCTD from challenging the grant of financial benefits on the enhanced pay scales for the aforesaid period.

28. Lastly, coming to the aspect of the budgetary allocation, it is borne out from the record that during the course of proceedings this Court *vide* order dated 27.03.2019, on submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties, recorded that the financial burden of Rs. 50 crores would be involved in giving necessary benefits to the concerned members of the petitioners' association, and it was directed that *the learned D&SJ (HQ) shall keep aside Rs.50 crores for the disbursement, should this Court so directs later*. Presumably, such budgetary allocation is being kept aside so as to comply with any directions that may be passed by this Court.

29. Accordingly, the respondent/GNCTD is given one last and final opportunity to take the following actions:

- (i) work out the arrears of pay benefits resulting from the upgradation of pay scales for the concerned Stenographers w.e.f. 01.01.1996 to 31.07.2018, within four weeks from today as tabulated hereunder:

Name of Post	Previous Scales	From 01.01.1996 to 31.12.2005	From 01.01.2006 to 01.12.2013



Stenographer Grade III	4000-6000	5500-9000	PB-2, 9300-34800 GP 4600
Stenographer Grade II	5000-8000	6500-10500	PB-2, 9300-34800 G.P. 4800
Stenographer Grade I	6500- 10500	10000-15200	PB-3, 15600-39100 G.P. 6600

(ii) It is directed that in case financial burden or expenditure comes to more than Rs. 50 crores, necessary financial approval and sanction shall be accorded by the respondent/GNCTD to the learned D&SJ (HQ);

(iii) In case any further queries or clarifications are required and there is any issue about fresh estimates to be given, same may be done within two weeks from the date of this judgment and any clarifications on the subject may be sought from learned D&SJ (HQ), which shall be dealt with as expeditiously as possible;

(iii) It is further directed that arrears so computed be sanctioned and released to the concerned Stenographers, within eight weeks from the date of this judgment;

(iv) Let compliance report be filed by the respondent/ GNCTD on or before the next date of hearing.

30. Re-notify on 08.01.2025.

DHARMESH SHARMA, J.

OCTOBER 23, 2024/Ch