

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

(338)

CWP No.3423 of 1997 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 09.09.2015.

Balram Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Sourabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J.(Oral)

Short question for consideration in this matter is relating to grant of voluntary retirement and extension of two additional increments by virtue of additional qualification acquired by the petitioner while he was in service.

Learned counsel for the respondents pointed out from the written statement that on 30.07.1997, the first grievance relating to voluntary retirement has been considered and petitioner was permitted to retire voluntary w.e.f.31.12.1990 vide Annexure R1.

Insofar as 2nd prayer is concerned a decision was taken by the respondents with reference to F.D.Hry. No.3.21 PR (FD)-80 dated 7.08.80 relating to grant of two increments to graduate Clerks/Stenographers. The benefit of two advance increments is not admissible in the case of revised

scale of pay. However, in the case of employees who are appointed as such during the period from 01.04.1979 to 28.02.1980 and also in the case of those who acquired these qualifications during the above period this benefit will be taken into account while fixing their pay in the revised scale of pay.

In view of the said policy, the petitioner do not fulfil the conditions for extending two additional increments. Therefore, the petitioner has not made out a case insofar as grant of two additional increments.

Accordingly, Ist prayer do not survive for consideration and insofar as 2nd prayer is concerned, it is rejected.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

September 09, 2015.
pooja saini