

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.SURENDRA MOHAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

WEDNESDAY, THE 2ND DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2015/11TH BHADRA, 1937

WA.No. 1860 of 2015 () IN WP(C).24255/2014

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 24255/2014 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA DATED 27-10-2014

APPELLANT(S)/APPELLANT/RESPONDENTS 1 TO 3:

- 1. UNION OF INDIA
(UOI)REP BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LABOUR & DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT
NEW DELHI 110001**
- 2. REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER
EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND ORGANISATION
(EPFO)BHAVISHYANIDHI BHAVAN
PATTON PALACE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695004**
- 3. ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER
SUB REGIONAL OFFICE
EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND ORGANISATION
(EPFO)BHAVISHYANIDHI BHAVAN
KALOOR, ERNAKULAM**

**BY ADVS.SRI.N.N.SUGUNAPALAN (SR.)
SMT.T.N.GIRIJA, SC,EPF ORGANISATION**

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS:

- 1. K.GEORGE JACOB
KANNATHRA HOUSE, H NO.XXXV/278, P A BEERA KUTTY ROAD
KOONAMTHAI, EDAPPALLY P O, KOCHI 682024**
- 2. JOSE ABRAHAM
THERADIAL HOUSE PRA 11, PARAKKATTIL LANE, AZAD ROAD
KALOOR, ERNAKULAM**
- 3. DR V P MATHEW
VATTAPPALLIL HOUSE, KOKKAPPILLY P O, THIRUVANKULAM
ERNAKULAM**
- 4. ERNAKUAM REGIONAL CO-OPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS UNION LIMITED
REPBY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, EDAPPALLY P O
ERNAKULAM 682024**

**R1 TO R3 BY SRI.P.N.MOHANAN
R4 BYSMT.LATHA KRISHNAN**

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 02-09-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**K.SURENDRA MOHAN &
SHAJI P. CHALY, JJ.**

W.A. No.1860 of 2015

Dated this the 2nd day of September, 2015

J U D G M E N T

Surendra Mohan, J.

The appellants challenge the judgment of the learned Single Judge dated 27.10.2014 in W.P.(C) No.24255 of 2014.

2. Respondents 1 to 3, retired employees of the 4th respondent, had filed the Writ Petition seeking inter alia, a direction to the appellants to permit them to enjoy higher pensionary benefits as per the Employees Pension Scheme by computing pension contributions on the basis of their actual pay in excess of the ceiling limit and transferring contributions computed on the said basis to the Pension Fund. Respondents 1 to 3 are retired employees of the 4th respondent. They were covered under the provisions of the Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 and the Employees Pension Scheme, 1995.

3. At the time of promulgation of the Pension Scheme, there was a ceiling limit on the maximum pensionable salary, which was ₹6,500/- per month. Therefore, contributions towards the Pension fund were payable only on the said amount even in cases where the actual salary drawn by an employee was much higher. The said restriction has subsequently been removed.

4. In the present case, it is admitted that contributions at the rate of 12% of the salary of the employees together with an equal contribution of the employer, have been remitted to the Employees Provident Fund Organisation. However, only contributions computed at the rate of 8.33% of the maximum salary of ₹6,500/- have been remitted to the Employees Pension Fund. The balance amount has been retained by the Employees Provident Fund Organisation. The above action according to respondents 1 to 3 is not authorised by the Statute. The cut off date of 01.12.2004 stipulated for extending the benefits of removal

W.A. No.1860 of 2015

of the ceiling limit on salary is also attacked as arbitrary. The learned Single Judge has found in favour of respondents 1 to 3 on all the points and has allowed the Writ Petition.

5. Heard. The learned Single Judge has allowed the Writ Petition following the dictum of a Division Bench of this Court in another Writ Appeal. We notice that the issue has been conclusively decided by this Court in judgment dated 05.03.2013 in W.A.No.1137 of 2012, judgment dated 16.10.2014 in W.A.No.1442 of 2014 and judgment dated 07.01.2015 in W.A.No.1956 of 2014. A copy of judgment dated 06.08.2015 in W.A.No.1587 of 2015 has also been placed before us. It is also pointed out that the issue is pending consideration of the Apex Court in S.L.P Nos.16867 of 2013 and 7075 of 2014 besides, other connected cases at the instance of the appellants herein.

In view of the binding precedents of this Court on the point, we find no infirmity in the judgment appealed against. We note that the learned Single Judge has taken

W.A. No.1860 of 2015

care to make his orders and directions subject to the decision of the Apex Court in the matter. Therefore, no further directions are necessary to be issued in the said regard also.

In view of the above, this Writ Appeal is dismissed.

Sd/-
K.SURENDRA MOHAN,
JUDGE

Sd/-
SHAJI P.CHALY
JUDGE

kkj