

**MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 699 OF 2018

DISTRICT: - BEED.

Kalpna Digambarrao Kulkarni,

Age : 56 years, Occ. Pensioner,
(Since retired voluntarily),
R/o 365, Line Galli, Karanja Road,
Beed, District Beed.

.. APPLICANT.

V E R S U S

1. The Secretary,

Revenue & Forest Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai - 32.

2. Director,

Accounts & Treasuries,
Maharashtra State,
Office of Directorate,
Barrack No. 15 and 16,
Plot No. 176, Free Press Journal
Marg, Mumbai - 21.

3. The Joint Director,

(Accounts & Treasuries),
Aurangabad Division,
"Lekha Kosh Bhavan"
Fazalpur,
Aurangabad-431 001.

.. RESPONDENTS.

APPEARANCE : Shri. Sujeet D. Joshi, learned Advocate
for the applicant.

: Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting
Officer for the respondents.

CORAM : **B.P. PATIL, ACTING CHAIRMAN**

RESERVED ON : **20.08.2019**

PRONOUNCED ON : **26.08.2019**

ORDER

By filing the present Original Application, the applicant has challenged the communication dated 18.03.2017 issued by respondent No. 3 rejecting her representation for grant of the arrears of pay of the post of Sr. Accountant w.e.f. 23.07.2005 to 20.06.2015. The copy of the said communication is placed on record at page No. 12, Annexure 'A-1'.

2. The applicant joined the services as Jr. Clerk on 03.01.1984. She was in continuous service for the period of three years. However, on 25.05.1987 she was terminated from the services abruptly. Therefore, she filed Writ Petition No. 825/1987 before the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay Bench at Aurangabad. The Hon'ble High Court was pleased to grant interim relief in her favour and protected her services. However, respondents have made haste in relieving her and have not reinstated her in service. Thereafter, the Writ Petition has transferred to this Tribunal after its establishment and the same was numbered as T.A. No. 1231/1991. On 27.03.2001 the said T.A. has been disposed of and the Tribunal was pleased to set aside the order of

termination of the applicant. It has been further ordered by this Tribunal that the applicant shall be deemed to be in service. The State has assailed the order passed by this Tribunal dated 27.03.2001 by filing Writ Petition No. 3262/2001 before the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay Bench at Aurangabad. However, the said Writ Petition has been dismissed on 22.04.2002 by the Hon'ble High Court. Thereafter the Review Petition No. 5383/2002 was filed by the State for reviewing the order dated 22.4.2002. The said Review Petition also came to be dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court on 17.08.2002. Thereafter, by misconstruing the liberty granted by the Hon'ble High Court while dismissing the Review Petition, the respondents have filed Review Petition bearing M.A. No. 344/2002 before this Tribunal seeking review of the order dated 27.3.2001 passed by this Tribunal. This Tribunal had dismissed the said Review Petition on 16.10.2002 on the ground that the order dated 27.3.2001 passed by this Tribunal has been merged into the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature Bench at Aurangabad in Writ Petition No. 3262/2001.

3. After dismissal of the Review Petition the applicant was reinstated in service by an order dated 25.10.2002 in the pay

scale of Rs. 3050-4590. The applicant had immediately joined the duties and started performing the same. As per the order dated 27.3.2001 passed by this Tribunal the applicant shall be deemed to be continued in service. The applicant was waiting for the decision in respect of her termination from 26.5.1987 up to 24.10.2002 i.e. the period of 15 years. She was expecting that the said period would be counted as duty period for all the purposes and she would be given the benefit of the said service for all the purposes, but it was not done accordingly. The State has filed another Writ Petition No. 1239/2004 only in order to done away with their responsibility of paying the salary of about 15 years to the applicant, though earlier Writ Petition No. 3262/2001, as well as, the Review Application have been dismissed. The State has assailed the order dated 27.3.2001 in the Writ Petition No. 1239/2004. The said Writ Petition was disposed of on 23.8.2011 by the Hon'ble High Court. While disposing the said Writ Petition it has been ordered by the Hon'ble High Court that the applicant would not be entitled for grant of arrears of pay w.e.f. 1987 to 2002 on the principle of "No work, No pay". However, the Hon'ble High Court has directed to count the said period for the purpose of other benefits with

continuity of service from the date of initial appointment of the applicant. The State Government has challenged the said order before the Hon'ble Apex Court by filing Special Leave Petition, but it was dismissed on 21.8.2012.

4. It is further contention of the applicant that since the respondents had failed to comply with the order dated 27.03.2001 passed by this Tribunal and has confirmed by the Hon'ble High court, the applicant had moved this Tribunal by filing C.P. St. No. 425/2012. After dismissal of Special Leave Petition, the respondents were left with no other alternative than to comply with the order of this Tribunal dated 27.03.2001. Therefore, they have placed on record some orders passed by the Government hastily on 17.10.2012 showing that it had been issued in compliance of the order of the Tribunal. On the basis of those documents, this Tribunal was pleased to dispose of the Contempt Petition on 17.10.2012. After disposal of the said Contempt Petition the respondents have started raising one or the other objection in respect of passing of the qualifying examination etc. with the sole object of denying promotion on the basis of continuous service. As respondents were delaying in implementation of the order of the Tribunal, as well as, the order passed by the

Hon'ble High Court, the applicant was constrained to file another Contempt Petition under M.A. No. 64/2015. The said contempt petition was filed as the respondents have refused to regularize the period from the year 1987 to 2002. During the pendency of the contempt petition, the respondents have finally complied with the order dated 27.03.2001 by issuing the communication dated 20th April, 2015 by which the applicant was granted seniority w.e.f. 28.12.1983. The applicant has further contended that when her services were counted w.e.f. 28.12.1983, she came to be reinstated in service on the post of Clerk, she was also given the benefit of counting seniority w.e.f. 1983 and based on that, she was given promotion to the post of Senior Accountant under order dated 15.6.2015 but effect was given from 23.6.2015.

5. The applicant was not satisfied in respect of the said order but she joined the post of Senior Accountant and made representation to the respondent No. 3 raising the objection in respect of paragraph No. 4 contained in the order. She has claimed that the rise of pay should be given to her w.e.f. 23.6.2005 as she was actually performing duties with effect from the said date. The applicant had made representation to the respondents in that regard, but the respondents rejected

the said representation on 20.07.2015. Thereafter, the applicant again made representations dated 23.7.2015 and 19.11.2015, reiterating her request in respect of correction in paragraph No. 4 of the order dated 15.6.2015 and requested to give the arrears of pay w.e.f. 23.6.2005. Respondent No. 3 again rejected her representation by the communication dated 11.12.2015 and directed not to make any further correspondence, but the applicant again made representations on 21.12.2015 and 6.3.2017 and reiterated her request. In the meanwhile, the applicant has sought voluntary retirement w.e.f. 1.2.2016. The respondents passed speaking order dated 18.3.2017 and rejected her request on the ground that the applicant was given benefit of time bound promotion by sanctioning the pay scale of Senior Clerk w.e.f. 4.1.1996. It was further stated that while granting promotion to the applicant on the post of Senior Accountant, the applicant was given deemed date of promotion w.e.f. 23.6.2005 and the applicant was working as a Clerk w.e.f. 23.6.2005 to 21.6.2015 and, therefore, she has been given notional pay of the said period. It has been further stated by the respondent No. 3 that in view of the order dated 23.8.2015 passed by the Hon'ble High Court the

applicant will not be entitled to get any arrears of pay on the principle of “No work, No pay”. On the basis of the said order, the respondents rejected the claim of the applicant.

6. The applicant has challenged the said order by filing the present Original Application. It is contention of the applicant that while passing impugned order the respondent No. 3 has misread and misinterpreted the order dated 23.8.2011 passed by the Hon’ble High Court, wherein the Hon’ble High Court has restricted the payment of actual pay and allowances to the applicant on the principle of “No work, No pay” for the period from 26.5.1987 to 27.10.2002. It is her contention that the respondents have not considered the fact that she is working since 25.10.2002 and on 23.6.2005 she was working as a Clerk. When she has been given the benefit of Senior Accountant by the order dated 15.6.2015 w.e.f. 23.6.2005, there is nothing to prevent the respondents to extend the arrears of pay of the post of Senior Accountant w.e.f. 23.6.2015 till the date of her actual joining on the post i.e. on 21.6.2015. It is her contention that the impugned order is totally unwarranted and it has been passed only in order to deprive her from getting the fruits of arrears of pay. Therefore, she has prayed to quash and set aside the

impugned order dated 18.03.2017 by allowing the Original Application.

7. Respondent Nos. 2 & 3 have filed their affidavit in reply and resisted the contentions of the applicant. They have not disputed the facts regarding the appointment, termination of the applicant, previous litigations and reinstatement of the applicant in service. It is their contention that the applicant was given continuity and seniority from the date of joining i.e. 03.01.1984 vide orders of Finance Department dated 20.04.2015 as per the judgment of this Tribunal dated 27.03.2001. The pay of the applicant was, accordingly, fixed by the Joint Director, Accounts and Treasuries, Aurangabad. Thereafter, as the applicant was due for promotion on the post of Senior Accountant (Deputy Accountant cadre) she was given deemed date of promotion w.e.f. 23.06.2005 vide orders of the Joint Director, Accounts and Treasuries, Aurangabad and the applicant joined on the post of promotion on 22.06.2015. Till that date she was working as Senior Clerk. It is their contention that as per the provision of Rule 32 of Maharashtra Civil Services (General Condition of Services) Rules, 1981, the applicant is entitled for actual pay of that

post from the date of joining on the post of Senior Accountant i.e. from 23.06.2015.

8. It is their contention that they had filed Writ Petition 1239/2004 before the Hon'ble Bombay High Court Bench at Aurangabad, and it was decided finally by the Hon'ble High Court on 23.08.2011, wherein, it has been stated that since the present applicant was not in service from 1987 to 2002, on the principle of "No work No pay" she would not be entitled to claim any wages during that period. However, the said period would be condoned for counting the continuity of service and the present applicant would be deemed to be in continuous service from the date of her initial appointment for all the purposes. Accordingly, the period from 26.05.1987 to 27.10.2002 was regularized vide orders issued by the Finance Department dated 16.10.2012 and 29.11.2012. Similarly, the pay of the applicant for the period from 26.05.1987 to 27.10.2001 was fixed by awarding notional increments.

9. It is their further contention that after dismissal of SLP by the Hon'ble Supreme Court the petitioners complied the orders of this Tribunal dated 27.03.2001 by awarding

seniority and continuity to the applicant vide order dated 16.10.2012 and, therefore, the contempt petition came to be disposed of on 17.10.2012. The applicant submitted her representation through the Joint Director, Accounts and Treasuries, Aurangabad, for granting seniority from the date of her initial appointment. The said representation was forwarded to the Finance Department vide letter issued by the directorate of Accounts and Treasuries, Mumbai dated 04.05.2013. The Finance Department by letter dated 30.10.2013 directed to award notional increments from 26.05.1987 to 27.10.2002 and granted the seniority from 2003 i.e. from the date of passing the requisite Departmental Examination prescribed for the post of Junior Clerk. Aggrieved by the said communication, the applicant filed another Contempt Petition No. 64/2015 before this Tribunal. In that contempt petition the Tribunal passed an order dated 17.04.2015 and passed remark that the Government by communication dated 30.10.2013 has turned down the request of the applicant. The communication dated 30.10.2013 is, *prima facie*, independent act of contempt. No explanation has come forward as to how this act would not be a contempt, and transferred the matter to the Mumbai Bench

of this Tribunal and adjourned the hearing till 27.04.2015. On the basis of the remarks passed by this Tribunal Finance Department, Government of Maharashtra vide orders dated 20.04.2015 and 24.04.2015 cancelled the previous orders dated 30.10.2013 and granted the seniority to the applicant from the date of her initial appointment i.e. from 03.01.1984. The applicant was working as Senior Clerk up to 15.06.2015. She was given promotion on the post of Senior Accountant vide orders dated 15.06.2015 and was given deemed date for the post of Senior Clerk from 23.06.2005. She was given notional increments up to 22.06.2015 as she joined on the said post. It is their contention that the responsibilities of the post of Senior Accountant are greater than that of Senior Clerk. Therefore, the applicant is entitled for Pay and Allowances of the post of Senior Accountant from the date of joining on the said post i.e. from 22.06.2015, in view of the provisions of Rule 32 of the Maharashtra Civil Services (General Conditions of Services) Rules 1981. Therefore, the benefit was awarded to her accordingly. It is their contention that the applicant had not worked on the post of Senior Accountant from 23.06.2005 up to 22.06.2015, and therefore, she is not entitled for the pay of the said post. Therefore, the

request of the applicant was rejected by the Joint Director, Accounts and Treasuries, Aurangabad. It is their contention that higher pay is admissible when the respective employee joins on the post of promotion. Therefore, the request of the applicant has been rightly rejected by the respondents by communication dated 18.03.2017, in view of the provisions of Rule 32 of the M.C.S. (General Conditions of Services) Rules, 1981. It is their contention that there is no illegality in the impugned order and, therefore, prayed to reject the Original Application.

10. I have heard the arguments advanced by Shri S.D. Joshi, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents. I have perused the application, affidavit, affidavit in reply filed by the respondents. I have also perused the documents placed on record by both the parties.

11. Admittedly, the applicant has joined the services as Jr. Clerk on 03.01.1984. She was in continuous service for the period of three years. Admittedly, on 25.05.1987 she was terminated from the services abruptly. Admittedly, the applicant had filed Writ Petition No. 825/1987 before the

Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay Bench at Aurangabad. The Hon'ble High Court was pleased to grant interim relief in the form of protection of her services. Admittedly, the respondents have made haste in relieving the applicant and have not reinstated her in service. Thereafter, the Writ Petition has been transferred to this Tribunal after its establishment and the same was numbered as T.A. No. 1231/1991. Admittedly, on 27.03.2001 the said T.A. has been disposed of and the Tribunal was pleased to set aside the order of termination of the applicant. It has been observed by this Tribunal while deciding the said T.A. that the applicant shall be deemed to be in service. Admittedly, thereafter, the State has assailed the order passed by this Tribunal dated 27.03.2001 by filing Writ Petition No. 3262/2001 before the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay Bench at Aurangabad, which came to be dismissed on 22.04.2002. Thereafter the State has filed the Review Petition No. 5383/2002 for reviewing the order dated 22.4.2002 passed in the Writ Petition No. 3262/2001, but it was dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court on 17.08.2002. Thereafter, on the basis of liberty granted by the Hon'ble High Court while dismissing the Review Petition, the respondents

have filed Review Petition bearing M.A. No. 344/2002 before this Tribunal seeking review of the order dated 27.3.2001 passed by this Tribunal. This Tribunal had dismissed the said Review Petition on 16.10.2002 on the ground that the order dated 27.3.2001 passed by this Tribunal has merged into the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature Bench at Aurangabad in Writ Petition No. 3262/2001. Admittedly, after dismissal of the Review Petition the applicant was reinstated in service by an order dated 25.10.2002 in the pay scale of Rs. 3050-4590. Admittedly, the applicant had immediately joined the duties and started performing the same. The respondents thereafter again filed one more Writ Petition No. 1239/2004 before the Hon'ble Bombay High Court Bench at Aurangabad. It was decided on 23.8.2011, wherein it has been held that the applicant would not be entitled to get arrears of pay w.e.f. 1987 to 2002 on the principle of "No work, No pay". However, the Hon'ble High Court has directed to count the said period for the purpose of other benefits with continuity of service from the date of initial appointment of the applicant. The respondents have challenged the said order before the Hon'ble Apex Court by filing Special Leave Petition, but it was dismissed on

21.8.2012. The applicant has filed C.P. St. No. 425/2012 before this Tribunal as the respondents had not complied with the order dated 27.3.2001 passed by this Tribunal. In compliance of the order passed by this Tribunal the respondents issued the orders showing that they have complied with the order of this Tribunal. Therefore, the said contempt petition came to be disposed of. Thereafter, also the respondents had not granted benefit to the applicant. Therefore, the applicant has filed another C.P. under M.A. No. 64/2015 before this Tribunal. The said contempt petition was filed as the respondents have refused to regularize the period from 1987 to 2002. During the pendency of the contempt petition, the respondents have finally complied with the order dated 27.03.2001 by issuing the communication dated 20th April, 2015 and granted seniority to the applicant w.e.f. 28.12.1983. Thereafter, she has been promoted on the post of Senior Accountant by the order dated 15.6.2015. Deemed date of promotion was given from 23.6.2005, but the financial benefit was given to her w.e.f. 23.6.2015. Therefore, the applicant filed representation before the respondents and respondents rejected the said representation. But the final

representation has been decided by the impugned communication dated 18.3.2017 by giving sound reasons.

12. Learned Advocate for the applicant has submitted that the applicant was reinstated in service in view of the order passed by this Tribunal in T.A. No. 1231/1991 in the year 2002. Since then she was in service continuously till her voluntary retirement on 1.2.2016. He has submitted that in the earlier litigation the Hon'ble High Court has directed the respondents to count the said period for the purpose of all other benefits with continuity of service from the date of her initial appointment. However, the Hon'ble High Court has observed that the applicant would not be entitled to get arrears of pay w.e.f. 1987 to 2002 on the principle of "No work, No pay". He has argued that in spite of directions given by the Hon'ble High Court and this Tribunal the respondents had not issued the orders regarding continuity of her service and extended other benefits to the applicant. Therefore, she moved this Tribunal by filing contempt petition. He has submitted that lastly the respondents granted the benefit of continuity in service and given seniority to the applicant w.e.f. 1983. He has submitted that by the order dated 15.6.2015 the applicant was promoted on the post of Senior Accountant.

Deemed date of promotion was given to the applicant w.e.f. 23.6.2005. He has submitted that the respondents have illegally denied to pay arrears of the promotional post w.e.f. 23.6.2015 though she had worked on the post of Senior Clerk. He has submitted that there was no reason to deny the arrears of pay to the applicant on the promotional post from 23.01.2005. Therefore, she made several representations to the respondents, but the respondents had not considered her claim and rejected her request by the impugned order on the ground that she was not entitled to get arrears of pay on the principle of "No work, No pay". He has submitted that the respondents have wrongly relied on the decision of the Hon'ble High Court in W.P. No. 1239/2004, wherein the Hon'ble High Court has observed that, "Since the respondents were not in service from 1987 to 2002, on the principle of "No work No Pay" they would not be entitled to claim any wages during that period". He has submitted that in the said order it has been specifically mentioned by the Hon'ble High Court that the said period should be condoned by continuity of service and the respondents / present applicant would be deemed to be in continuous service from her initial date of appointment for all

other purposes. It has been observed by the Hon'ble High Court that the respondents i.e. applicant in the present O.A. was not in service from 1987 to 2002, and, therefore, she would not be entitled to claim any wages during that period on the principle of "No work, No pay". He has submitted that the said observations are limited to the extent of the said period only, but the respondents have given much weightage to it and applied it to the subsequent period, which is illegal. Therefore, they prayed to quash the impugned order.

13. Learned Presenting Officer for the respondents has submitted that the applicant was working as Senior Clerk on the date of issuance of the order dated 15.6.2015 by which the applicant has been promoted. He has submitted that the applicant was promoted on the post of Senior Accountant w.e.f. 23.6.2005, but during the period from 23.6.2005 to 22.6.2015 the applicant was actually worked as Senior Clerk and she had not discharged the duties assigned to the promotional post i.e. for the post of Senior Accountant. Therefore, she is not entitled to get higher pay in view of the provision of Rule 32 of M.C.S. (General Conditions of Services) Rules, 1981 and, therefore, the respondents have rightly rejected the claim of the applicant and, therefore, he

supported the impugned order. He has submitted that the responsibilities of the post of Senior Accountant are greater than the responsibilities attached to the Senior Clerk and higher pay is admissible only from the date on which the duties of new post are taken in view of the provisions of Rule 32 of the M.C.S. (General Condition of Services) Rules, 1981. He has submitted that the applicant joined higher post on 22.6.2015 and till that date she was working on the post of Senior Clerk. Since she has not taken charge of the promotional post till 22.6.2015, she was not entitled to get higher pay attached to the promotional post and, therefore, she was not granted financial benefits in view of the orders dated 15.6.2015. He has submitted that the respondents have rightly rejected the representation of the applicant by the impugned communication and there is no illegality in it. Therefore, he has prayed to dismiss the Original Application.

14. On perusal of the record, it reveals that the applicant has been reinstated as Senior Clerk in the year 2002 in pursuance of the order dated 27.3.2001 passed by this Tribunal and since then she got seniority. She was not in service during the period from 1987 to 2002, but the said period was condoned by the Hon'ble High Court and

directions were given to condone the said period for counting the continuity of service and the applicant would be deemed to be in continuous service from the date of her initial appointment for all other purposes, while deciding the W.P. No. 1239/2004. In the said decision it has been specifically held that the applicant would not be entitled to get any wages on the principle of "No work No pay" during the period from 1987 to 2002 as she was not in service. In pursuance of the said directions the applicant was promoted on the post of Senior Accountant w.e.f. 23.6.2005 in view of the order dated 15.6.2015. By the said impugned order the effect of promotion was given w.e.f. 23.6.2005, but actual financial benefits were extended to the applicant from 23.6.2015. The record shows that during the period from 23.6.2005 to 22.6.2015 the applicant had worked on the post of Senior Clerk. There is no dispute about the fact that the higher responsibilities were attached to the post of Senior Accountant than the responsibilities attached to the post of Senior Clerk. There is no dispute about the fact that the directions given by the Hon'ble High Court in W.P. No. 1239/2004 that the applicant would not be entitled to claim any wages during the period specified therein i.e. during the

period from 1987 to 2002 only. Therefore, the said directions were not applicable for further period and more particularly to the disputed period i.e. commencing from 23.6.2005 to 22.6.2015. By the impugned order it had been made clear that the notional pay of the applicant will be fixed from 23.6.2005 the date on which the applicant was promoted and the said period has been considered for granting increments and on the basis of the same, pay will be fixed on the date of joining of promotional post by the applicant. The respondents refused to grant arrears of pay of the promotional post to the applicant for the period from 23.6.2005 to 22.6.2015 on the ground that the applicant actually worked on the promotional post from 22.6.2015 and she never discharged the duties assigned to the promotional post i.e. Senior Accountant prior that. Therefore, she is not entitled to get higher pay on the promotional post in view of the provision of Rule 32 of Maharashtra Civil Services (General Condition of Services) Rules, 1981. The said rule is material and relevant for deciding the issue involved in the present Original Application. Therefore, it would be appropriate to reproduce the said rule 32 of Maharashtra

Civil Services (General Condition of Services) Rules, 1981.

The said rule 32 reads as under: -

“32. How the date of promotion is determined.-

The promotion of a Government servant from a lower to a higher post, his duties remaining the same, takes effect from the date on which the vacancy occurs, unless it is otherwise ordered. But, when the promotion involves the assumption of a new post with enlarged responsibilities, the higher pay is admissible only from the date on which the duties of the new post are taken.”

15. On plain reading of the said rule it reveals that when the promotion involves the assumption of a new post with enlarged responsibilities, the higher pay is admissible only from the date on which the duties of the new posts are taken. Therefore, in view of the said rule the applicant is entitled to get higher pay admissible to her only from the date on which she joined the new promotional post. The applicant joined new promotional post i.e. the post of Senior Accountant on 22.6.2015. Therefore, higher pay is admissible to her from that date only. The post of Senior Accountant has higher responsibility than the post of Senior Clerk and, therefore, in view of the said rule the applicant is entitled to get the higher

pay on the date of joining of new promotional post. The respondents have rightly considered the provision of the said rule 32 of Maharashtra Civil Services (General Condition of Services) Rules, 1981 and granted financial benefits to the applicant from the date of joining the new promotional post though the deemed date of promotion was given to the applicant w.e.f. 23.6.2005. The impugned order is issued in accordance with the rule 32 of Maharashtra Civil Services (General Condition of Services) Rules, 1981. The respondents have considered the deemed date of promotion for increment purposes and, therefore, in my view, there is no illegality in the impugned order. Hence, no interference is called for in the impugned order. There is no merit in the Original Application. Consequently, it deserves to be dismissed.

16. In view of the discussion in the foregoing paragraphs, the Original Application stands dismissed without any order as to costs.

ACTING CHAIRMAN

PLACE : AURANGABAD.

DATE : 26.08.2019

O.A.NO.699-2018(SB-arrears of pay)-HDD-2019