# MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

### NAGPUR BENCH NAGPUR

# **ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 153/2016**

Shri Ramesh Pandharinath Randive, Aged about 43 years, Occ. Mathematics Instructor, Industrial Training Institute, Allapalli, Dist. Gadchiroli Resident of Allapalli, Dist. Gadchiroli.

Applicant.

#### Versus

- State of Maharashtra through its Secretary, Higher and Technical Education, Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
- The Director, Vocational Education & Training, 3, Mahanagar Palikar Marg, Post Box No.10036, Mumbai-1.
- The Joint Director, Vocational Education and Training, Regional Office, Civil Lines, Nagpur.
- 4) The Principal, Industrial Training Institute, Allapalli, Dist. Gadchiroli.
- 5) The Principal, Industrial Training Institute, Chandrapur.

Respondents.

### Shri Vishal Anand, Advocate for the applicant.

Shri H.K. Pande, P.O. for the respondents.

<u>Coram</u> :- Hon'ble Shri J.D. Kulkarni, Vice-Chairman (J).

Dated :- 30/03/2017

### ORDER -

Heard Shri Vishal Anand, ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri H.K. Pande, ld. P.O. for the respondents.

2. The applicant was appointed as a Mathematics Instructor by the respondent no.3 vide order dated 8<sup>th</sup> June,1999 and has joined his services at Industrial Training Institute, Allapalli, Dist. Gadchiroli. Vide order dated 19<sup>th</sup> June,2009 the applicant was transferred to the Industrial Training Institute, Chandrapur which is a Tribal/ Naxal As per G.R. dated 06-08-2002 issued by the affected area. Government of Maharashtra the employees serving in Tribal / Naxal Affected area should have been given the pay scale of the next promotional post. The respondents were therefore obliged to give regular increment of pay scale to the applicant from the said promotional post, w.e.f. 1-7-2009 as the applicant's date of increment was 1<sup>st</sup> July of every month. However, the respondents have not been given that pay scale to the applicant w.e.f.1-7-2009. The applicant made a representation for getting increment from 1-7-2009. However vide communication dated 24-06-2015 his claim was rejected and therefore the applicant has filed this O.A. The applicant is claiming that the communication dated 24<sup>th</sup> June,2015 (A-7,P-28) issued by respondent no.3 be guashed and set aside and the respondents be directed to grant regular increment to the applicant w.e.f. 1-7-2009

2

and thereafter to grant pay scale of next promotional post and pay arrears of salary and all the consequential benefits to the applicant.

3. The respondents admitted the fact that the applicant was transferred in naxalite affected area and was entitled to next promotional pay scale as per G.R. dated 31-8-2009. It is stated that the applicant has been paid such increment as per the said G.R. and the fixation has been done properly. It is stated that the applicant has not opted for any option for regular pay fixation and the pay has been fixed as per the G.R.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that initial date of increment of the applicant is 1<sup>st</sup> of July of every year. He further submits that since the applicant has joined his post on transferred at Chandrarpur on 19<sup>th</sup> June,2009, the applicant was entitled to next promotional pay scale as per the G.Rs. dated 6-8-2002 and because his date of increment is 1<sup>st</sup> July of every year, the next increment should have been granted on 1<sup>st</sup> July,2009. From this, it seems that the applicant wants higher pay scale on 19-6-2009 and next increment on 1<sup>st</sup> July,2009. Such a demand cannot be accepted. An employee is entitled to get increment after completion of one year of service in particular Grade Pay and not prior to that.

5. Perusal of the G.R. and record shows that the applicant was given benefit of next higher pay scale in view of the G.R. dated

3

6-8-2002 from the date on which he joined in the naxalite affected area. Admittedly, the applicant joined on 19-6-2009 and therefore from 19-6-2009 his pay scale was fixed in the next higher pay scale. In this regard the G.R. dated 31-8-2009 is specific and particularly para-3 of the said G.R. reads as under :-

^^3- ojhyiæk.ks; kstupk ykHk feGky¥; k 'kkI dh; deipk&; kI ; kstuß; k ykHkkP; k fnukadkikI w vFkok R; kP; k iœhy osruok<hP; k fnukadkikI w osru fuf'prh dj.; kpk fodYi nsrk; b3y- v'kk izdj.kh] osru fuf'prh o iœhy osruok< [kkyhyiæk.ksvuK(s dj.; kr; koh-

v- i kity or uok<h?; k fnukadki kl w or u fuf'prh dj.; kpk fodYi fnyš; k 'kkl dh; deipk&; k?; k ckcrhr ; kstu?; k ykHkk?; k fnukadkl R; k?; k or u cMe/; s cny gkskkj ukgh- ek=] R; kl ; FkkfLFkrh ojhy ¼1½ vFkok ¼2½ i ek.ks vuk(s, xM or u eatuj dj.; kr ; kos R; kwrj i kity or uok<h?; k fnukadkl R; kph i wor uf 'prh dj.; kr ; koh R; k fno'kh R; kl i Fke okf"kd or uok< vkf.k nd jh i nkslurhph or uok< v'kk nksu or uok<h ns; kr ; k0; kr- ; k or uok<h i fjxf.kr djrkuk ; kstu?; k ykHkki khz feGr vl ysysenG or u %or u cM e/khy or u \$ xMor u½ fopkjkr?ks; kr ; kos

c- ; kstuß; k ykHkkP; k fnukadki kl w oru fuf'prhdj.; kpk fodYi fny¥; k  $\vee$  Fkok rl s let.; kr  $\vee$  ky¥; k 'kkl dh; deipk&; kP; k ckcrhr] R; kyk 2 twySrs1 tkupkjh ; k dkyko/khr ; kstupk ykHk feGkyk  $\vee$  l Y; kl R; kl i  $\kappa$  hy oruok< i  $\kappa$  hy 1 twySjksth ns; kr ; koh- i jarij R; kyk l  $\epsilon$  fi/kr o"kkP; k 2 tkupkjh rs30 tw njE; ku ; kstupk ykHk feGkyk  $\vee$  l Y; kl R; kl i  $\kappa$  hy o"kkP; k 1 twySjksth oruok< feGsy-

fnukad 1-1-2006 i kohzlokarxir vk'okflrixrh; kstupk ykHk vukKs dj.; kr vkyk vlsy R; kuk ; k vknskkrhy ifjPNsn 2 ¼1½ e/khy i kkZxM osrukph rjrm ykxw jkghy-\*\*

6. Had it been a fact that the applicant wants to get increment on 1<sup>st</sup> July of every year, he should have given option as required in para-3 of the said G.R. In any case the applicant cannot claim higher pay scale as well as next increment in the said pay scale

just within a span of one month. In the impugned communication the respondents have rightly communicated to the applicant that he is not entitled to claim next increment immediately after one month and I do not find any illegality in the said communication. I therefore do not find any merit in the O.A. Hence, the following order:-

## <u>ORDER</u>

(i) The O.A. stands dismissed with no order as to costs.

(J.D. Kulkarni) Vice-Chairman (J).

dnk.