

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28-04-2018

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P. Nos.11235 and 11236 of 2018

And

W.M.P.No.13138 and 13139 of 2018

K.Senthamarai Kannan .. Petitioner in WP 11235/18
K.Selva Ganesan .. Petitioner in WP 11236/18

Vs.

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu
rep. by its Principal Secretary to Government
Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009
 2. The Director of Rural Development and
Panchayat Raj
Panagal Building,
Saidapet,
Chennai-600 015
 3. The District Collector
Collectorate,
Tiruvannamalai District.
 4. The Accountant General,
Accounts and Entitlement,
Nandhanam,
Chennai-600 018.
- सत्यमेव जयते Respondents in both WPs

PRAYER : Petitions filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of Writs of Certiorarified mandamus, calling for the records pertaining to paragraph 4(b) of G.O.Ms.No.77 Rural Development and Panchayat Raj department dated 12.7.2013 of the first respondent and quash the same in so far it relates to the petitioner and further direct the respondents to count 50% of the services rendered by the petitioners husband in the post of part time Panchayat Clerk along with regular service for the purpose of pension and consequently, directing the respondents to count 50% service rendered by the petitioner in the post of Part Time Panchayat

Clerk from 1.9.1979 till 5.11.1999 and 1.11.1979 till 15.12.1992 respectively, along with regular service for the purpose of granting pension and other pensionary benefits.

For Petitioner in both WPs : Mr.V.Ravikumar

For Respondents-1to3 : Mr.V.Kadhirvelu,
in both Wps Special Government Pleader.

C O M M O N O R D E R

The relief sought for in both these Writ Petitions are common. These Writ Petitions have been filed challenging the first paragraph 4(b) of G.O.Ms.No.77 Rural Development and Panchayat Raj (PA4) Department dated 12.07.2013, issued by the first respondent. A direction is also sought to count 50% of the services rendered by the petitioners in the post of part time Panchayat Clerk along with regular services for the purpose of granting pensionary benefits.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioners contended that the issue involved in these Writ Petitions have been considered by two different Hon'ble Division Benches of this Court, on the same line. The first Judgement was pronounced on 11th April, 2016 in W.A.No.431 of 2016 and the following paragraphs of the Judgment are relevant for the purpose of deciding these Writ Petitions:

"4 The State Government took a policy decision by G.O.Ms.No.39, Rural Development and Panchayat (E5) Department dated 13 June 2011, (for short "G.O. Ms.No.39") whereunder, it was clearly observed that an employee, working in Panchayat as Full Time Clerk or Part Time Clerk and having been absorbed by the Government prior to 01 April 2003, will be entitled to counting 50% of the service as part time employee under the consolidated pay for the purpose of computation of pensionary benefits. Subsequently, the said Government Order, as pleaded by the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the appellants, was amended by G.O.Ms.No.77, Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department dated 12 July 2013 (for short "G.O. Ms.No.77"), whereunder, counting of 50% of service in case of Part Time Clerks was withdrawn.

5. In the case on hand, indisputably, the respondents 1 and 2 were absorbed as Junior Assistant before 01 April 2003, subsequent to

which the first respondent was promoted as Assistant and retired from service on 31 4 December 2009 and the second respondent retired as Cashier on 30 June 2007. Thus, the respondents 1 and 2 are entitled to the benefit as granted in G.O.Ms.No.39 and the subsequent Government Order in G.O.Ms.No.77, would not be applicable to those employees, who were entitled to the benefit before issuance of the said Government Order.

6. The learned single Judge has rightly come to the conclusion that 50% of the service period put in by the respondents 1 and 2 under the consolidated pay by way of part time employment will be computed for pensionary benefits. We do not find any reason to take a view contrary to the one taken by the learned single Judge.

With the aforesaid observations, the writ appeal stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected C.M.P. is closed. "

3. Another Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court passed a Judgment on 24th June 2016 in W.A.No.612 of 2016, as extracted under:

"3. The grievance of the first respondent is that the services rendered by him as Part Time Panchayat Clerk was not taken into consideration while calculating pension. Therefore, he filed a writ petition and the same was allowed on 27.6.2014, along with similar writ petitions, holding that 50% of the services rendered by the writ petitioners as Part Time Panchayat Clerk should be taken into account while calculating pension and directing the concerned authority to calculate and issue orders granting pension and other benefits within a period of three months and to implement the same within a period of one month thereafter. Aggrieved by the same, the appellants have come up with this appeal.

4. As against the order of the learned single Judge dated 27.6.2014 3 passed in a batch of writ petitions, one of the writ petitioner, filed W.A.No.431 of 2016. A Division Bench of this Court, by judgment dated 11.4.2016, dismissed the appeal, holding that the learned single Judge had rightly concluded that the 50% of the services rendered by the petitioners therein under the consolidated pay by way of part time employment has to be taken into account for pensionary benefits.

5. In view of the decision of the Division Bench of this Court dated 11.4.2016 made in W.A.No.431 of 2016, this writ appeal is also dismissed in terms of the above judgment. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, CMP No.8080 of 2016 is closed. "

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners contended that the Judgments of the Hon'ble Division Benches were implemented by the respondents in G.O.(P) No.111 RD & Panchayat Raj (PA5) Department dated 14.3.2016. Thus the writ petitioners herein are also eligible to get the same benefits extended to the other similarly placed employees worked as part time employees and absorbed as regular employees in the cadre of Junior Assistant.

5. The learned Special Government Pleader opposed the contentions raised by the writ petitioners by stating that the writ petitioners are not eligible to get the benefits, as contended by the learned counsel for the writ petitioners.

6. Since the issue has been decided by the two different Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court on the same line, no exception can be drawn, by considering the arguments advanced by the learned Special Government Pleader in this regard.

7. In this view of the matter, both these Writ Petitions stand disposed and the benefits granted by the two different Division Benches of this Court in W.A.No.431 of 2016 dated 11th April, 2016 and in W.A.No.612 of 2016, dated 24th June 2016, respectively are directed to be extended to both these Writ Petitioners also. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

Sd/-

सत्यमेव जयते
Assistant Registrar(CS II)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Secretary to Government
Government of Tamil Nadu
Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009

2.The Director of Rural Development and
Panchayat Raj
Panagal Building, 1, Jeenis Road,
Saidapet,
Chennai-600 015


3.The District Collector
Collectorate,
Tiruvannamalai District.

4.The Accountant General,
Accounts and Entitlement,
Nandhanam,
Chennai-600 018.

+1cc to Mr.V.Ravikumar, Advocate Sr.No.32235

GJ(CO)
sm:11.5.2018

W.P. Nos.11235 and 11236 of 2018



WEB COPY