MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL NAGPUR BENCH NAGPUR ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 720 of 2022 (S.B.)

- (1) Dhanlal S/o. Shriram Sawarkar,Aged about 66 yrs., Occ.- Pensioner,R/o. Plot No. 60, Trust line Vishwakarma Nagar,Nagpur. Mob. 9923170271.
- (2) Shyamrao S/o. Chircutrao Raut, Aged 68 yrs., Occ.- Pensioner R/o. Musani layout Alodi, Sathoda Road, Wardha, Tah, + Distt. Wardha Mob. 9545765352.

Applicants.

Versus

- The State of Maharashtra, through its Secretary, Home Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
- 2) The Superintendent of Police Wireless East Zone, Nagpur, Katol Road near MSEB Office, Nagpur.
- 3) The Superintendent of police, Gondia Phulchur, Amgaon Road, Tah. + Dist. Gondia (MS).
- 4) The Accountant General -II (Accounts & Entitlement), Pension wing old building Post Box No. 114, GPO, Civil Line, Nagpur-440001, Maharashtra.
- 5) The Director General of Police, Maharashtra State Shahid Bhagatsingh marg, Mumbai-1.

Respondents.

Shri S.M. Khan, Advocate for the applicants.

Shri V.A. Kulkarni, learned P.O. for respondents.

Coram: Hon'ble Shri Justice M.G. Giratkar,

Vice Chairman.

Dated :- 29/01/2025.

JUDGMENT

Heard Shri S.M. Khan, learned counsel for the applicants and Shri V.A. Kulkarni, learned P.O. for the respondents.

2. The case of the applicants in short is as under –

Both the applicants retired after completion of age of superannuation. Applicant no.1 retired on 30/06/2014 and applicant no.2 retired on 30/06/2012. They were not granted increment which falls due on 1st July of the respective year. Therefore, they approached to this Tribunal for the following reliefs –

- "(7) (i) That quash and set-aside the impugned order vide Annexure-11 as it is illegal.
- ii) That give direction to the respondents to release one annual increment from the date of 01/07/2014 to the applicant No. 1 as well as from the date of 01/07/2012 to the applicant No. 2 fell on 1st July respectively while retirement.
- iii) That give direction to the Respondent to give retrospective effect to the gratuity, commutation and encashment and other consequential benefit.
- iv) That give direction to draw the arrears thereof within time frame limit."
- 3. The O.A. is strongly opposed by the respondents. It is submitted that the applicants have retired before 1st July of the respective year and therefore they are not entitled to get increment.

- The issue in respect of grant of increment which falls due on 1st 4. July of the respective year is settled by the Judgment Hon'ble Division Bench of Madras High Court in the case of P. Ayyamperumal Vs. The Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal and Others . The Division Bench of Madras High Court has held that the employee who retires on 30thJune is entitled to get increment which falls due on 1st July of the respective year. The said Judgment was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP No.6185/2020, the said SLP was dismissed on 11.04.2023. Thereafter, the Government of Maharashtra G.R. dated 28.06.2023.Now the Government of has issued Maharashtra has taken a decision to grant increment which falls due on 1st July.
- 5. During the course of submission, the learned counsel for applicants has submitted that applicant no.1 is granted increment which falls due on 1st July and therefore only issue in respect of applicant no.2 is to be decided. Applicant no.2 retired on 30/06/2012. Therefore, he is entitled to get increment which falls due on 1st July,2012. Hence, the following order –

<u>ORDER</u>

(i) The O.A. is allowed.

40.A. No. 720 of 2022

(ii) The respondents are directed to grant increment which falls due on

1st July of 2012 to applicant no.2 Shri Shyamrao Chircutrao Raut.

(iii) No order as to costs.

Dated :- 29/01/2025.

(Justice M.G. Giratkar) Vice Chairman.

dnk.

I affirm that the contents of the PDF file order are word to word same as per original Judgment.

Name of Steno : D.N. Kadam

Court Name : Court of Hon'ble Vice Chairman.

Judgment signed on : 29/01/2025.