

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO.6396 OF 2020

PRAKASH TULSHIRAM CHAUDHARI
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

None for the Petitioner.
AGP for the Respondents/ State : Shri S.K.Tambe

...

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
&
AVINASH G. GHAROTE, JJ.**

DATE :- 24th June, 2021

Per Court :-

1. Neither of the two learned advocates appearing on behalf of the petitioner are before us either online or from the court hall in which an arrangement to address the Court via video conferencing has been made.
2. We have heard the learned AGP on behalf of the respondents.
3. The petitioner has raised a very short issue before us. His retirement fell on 30.06.2019 and had he retired on 01.07.2019, he would have been entitled for annual increment as is provided under Rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008. Considering this provision, the Government of Maharashtra revised the Maharashtra Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2009 and brought uniformity in the payment

of annual increments. There is no dispute that the petitioner had worked up to 30.06.2019. He has thus, completed one year prior to his retirement. He would be entitled for an annual increment, but for the fact that the Rules prescribed that he would be entitled to such increment if he has worked on 01.07.2019, when it became payable.

4. The issue raised in this petition has been squarely covered by the judgment delivered by the learned Division Bench of the Madras High Court on 15.09.2017 in Writ Petition No.15732/2017 filed by ***P.Ayyamperumal vs. The Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal and others***. The facts in the case before the Madras High Court were set out in paragraphs 5 and 6 and the Madras High Court drew its conclusions in paragraph 7 and allowed the petition. Paragraphs 5 to 7 read as under :-

- “5. *The petitioner retired as Additional Director General, Chennai on 30.06.2013 on attaining the age of superannuation. After the Sixth Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July as the date of increment for all employees by amending Rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008. In view of the said amendment, the petitioner was denied the last increment, though he completed a full one year in service, i.e. from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013. Hence, the petitioner filed the original application in O.A.No.310/00917/2015 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, and the same was rejected on the ground that an incumbent is only entitled to increment on 1st July if he continued in service on that day.*
6. *In the case on hand, the petitioner got retired on 30.06.2013. As per the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008, the increment has to be given only on 01.07.2013, but he had been superannuated on*

30.06.2013 itself. The judgment referred to by the petitioner in State of Tamil Nadu, rep.by its Secretary to Government, Finance Department and others v. M.Balasubramaniam, reported in CDJ 2012 MHC 6525, was passed under similar circumstances on 20.09.2012, wherein this Court confirmed the order passed in WPNo.8440 of 2011 allowing the writ petition filed by the employee, by observing that the employee had completed one full year of service from 01.04.2002 to 31.03.2003, which entitled him to the benefit of increment which accrued to him during that period.

7. *The petitioner herein had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2013, but the increment fell due on 01.07.2013, on which date he was not in service. In view of the above judgment of this Court, naturally he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service, though the date of increment falls on the next day of his retirement. Applying the said judgment to the present case, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the first respondent-Tribunal dated 21.03.2017 is quashed. The petitioner shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2013, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. No costs."*

5. The judgment of the Madras High Court in ***P.Ayyamperumal*** (supra) was carried in Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No.22283/2018. By order dated 23.07.2018, the Honourable Supreme Court dismissed the said Special Leave Petition.

6. There is no dispute that Rule 10 of the Maharashtra Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2009 is identical to the amended Rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008 in relation to the

uniformity in annual increments.

7. Considering the above, this Writ Petition is allowed. As the petitioner is superannuated on 30.06.2019, we hold that he would be entitled to the last annual increment, which he has been deprived of and the respondents shall, accordingly, calculate the said monetary benefits expeditiously so as to be paid to the petitioner on or before 30.09.2021. So also, as the grant of this annual increment would affect his pension, gratuity, earned leave, commutation benefits, etc., the respondents would recalculate the same and make the payment of arrears on or before 30.09.2021 and shall ensure that the revised pension is also paid to the petitioner accordingly.

kps

(AVINASH G. GHAROTE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)