

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.13510 of 2015

Date of Decision: July 09, 2015

Union of India and others

.....Petitioners

versus

Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench and others

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr.P.C.Goyal, Advocate, for the petitioners.

-.-

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?

Surya Kant, J. (Oral)

Union of India through the Ministry of Defence as well as Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, have laid challenge to the order dated 20.12.2013 passed by Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, in terms of the consent accorded by both the parties and whereby the case has been disposed of with a direction to the authorities to “re-visit the issue regarding washing allowance payable to Industrial Personnel of the MES and apply the policy adopted in this regard uniformly across the formations of the MES...”

The above-stated direction came to be issued in a petition filed by private-respondents who are holding semi-skilled, skilled, highly skilled posts. Some of them are working as Master Craftsmen also. They were granted the washing allowance which was revised to Rs.60/- per month on the

recommendations of the 6th Central Pay Commission. Its arrears were to be paid w.e.f. 01.09.2008. It appears that after granting the benefit to private-respondents, the authorities vide the impugned order dated 07.05.2013 stayed the payment of washing allowance and recovery was ordered to be effected from the beneficiaries.

The question that arose for consideration was whether private-respondents were entitled to washing allowance at the pre-revised rate of Rs.30/- per month or at the revised rate of Rs.60/- per month at par with the Industrial employees in MES? The said controversy was disposed of vide the impugned order after taking notice of the statement made by counsel for the petitioners (official respondents) that they have no objection if the matter was referred to for re-consideration so that a uniform policy could be adopted.

In our considered view, the order under challenge is neither prejudicial to the petitioners nor it has finally determined the rights of parties. The petitioners have been merely directed to revisit the policy decision on the issue of payment of washing allowance and to adopt a uniform policy. Such a direction calls for no interference.

Dismissed.

[SURYA KANT]
JUDGE

July 09, 2015
mohinder

[P.B.BAJANTHRI]
JUDGE