

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

973 WRIT PETITION NO.14240 OF 2019

**DHANRAJ VIRSHETTY BIRADAR AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS**

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Shivkumar K. Mathpati
AGP for Respondent / State : Mr. S.B. Yawalkar
Advocate for Respondent No.4 : Mr. P.R. Tandale

...

AND

974 WRIT PETITION NO.14610 OF 2019

**VENKAT GUNAJIRAO WADJE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS**

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Amol G. Vasmatkar
AGP for Respondent / State : Mrs. R.P. Gour
Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 & 4 : Mr. S.B. Mene

...

AND

975 WRIT PETITION NO.14620 OF 2019

**PRADEEP KHANDERAO JADAHV
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS**

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Amol G. Vasmatkar
AGP for Respondent/ State : Mr. K.N. Lokhande
Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 & 4 : Mr. S.B. Mene

...

AND

976 WRIT PETITION NO.14621 OF 2019

BHAGWAN GHIVSEN JADHAV
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Amol G. Vasmatkar
AGP for Respondent / State : Mr. A.S. Shinde
Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 & 4 : Mr. S.B. Mene

...

AND

977 WRIT PETITION NO.14622 OF 2019

AVINASH RAGHVENDRA GAJENDRAGADKAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Amol G. Vasmatkar
AGP for Respondent / State : Mrs. V.N. Patil Jadhav
Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 & 4 : Mr. S.B. Mene

...

AND

978 WRIT PETITION NO.14636 OF 2019

RAJKUMAR BNARSANNA MUDPE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Amol G. Vasmatkar
AGP for Respondent / State : Mrs. M.A. Deshpande
Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 & 4 : Mr. S.B. Mene

...

AND

981 WRIT PETITION NO.1822 OF 2021

DINESH SUDAMRAO KARANDE AND OTHERS
VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. K.S. Bhale
AGP for Respondent / State : Mr. S.B. Yawalkar
Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 & 3 : Mr. M.N. Narwade

...

AND

**987 WRIT PETITION NO.4008 OF 2021
WITH WP/4010/2021 WITH WP/4009/2021**

DNYANESHWAR PANDURANG SAINDANE AND OTHERS
VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Estling S. Murge
AGP for Respondent / State : Mr. S.B. Yawalkar
Advocate for Respondent No.3 in WP Nos.4009 of 2021 & 4010 of
2021 : Mr. A.D. Aghav

...

AND

988 WRIT PETITION NO.5609 OF 2021

SANJAY SUDHAKARRAO KADAM AND OTHERS
VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Shivkumar K. Mathpati
AGP for Respondent / State : Mr. A.S. Shinde
Advocate for Respondent Nos.5 & 6 : Mr. V.C. Patil h/f. Mr. U.B.
Bondar
Advocate for Respondent No.9 : Mr. U.A. Bhadgaonkar

...

AND

989 WRIT PETITION NO.5639 OF 2021

SAMPAT KADUBA SABLE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Estling S Murge
AGP for Respondent / State : Mr. A.S. Shinde
Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 & 3 : Ms. Manjusha Deshpande

...

AND

990 WRIT PETITION NO.5723 OF 2021

SAHEBRAO ANANDRAO GAVANE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Shivkumar K. Mathpati
AGP for Respondent / State : Ms. R.P. Gour
Advocate for Respondent Nos.5 & 6 : Mr. V.C. Patil h/f. Mr. U.B.
Bondar

...

AND

992 WRIT PETITION NO.8423 OF 2021

KAILAS RAMDAS DHEPLE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Estling S. Murge
AGP for Respondent / State : Mrs. M.A. Deshpande
Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 & 3 : Mr. V.C. Patil h/f. Mr. U.B.
Bondar

...

AND

993 WRIT PETITION NO.8427 OF 2021

BALKRISHNA VYANKATRAO TAMBARE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Estling S. Murge
AGP for Respondent / State : Mrs. M.A. Deshpande
Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 & 3: Mrs. S.S. Renge

...

AND

994 WRIT PETITION NO.9375 OF 2021

KESHVRAO SADASHIV PATIL
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Shivkumar K. Mathpati
AGP for Respondent / State : Mr. K.N. Lokhande
Advocate for Respondent No.7 : Mr. A.N. Kakade

...

AND

995 WRIT PETITION NO.9508 OF 2021

SHIVSHANKAR SANGRAM PATIL AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Shivkumar K. Mathpati
AGP for Respondent / State : Mrs. M.A. Deshpande

...

AND

996 WRIT PETITION NO.9513 OF 2021

SHYAM MAROTIRAO KAVLE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Shivkumar K Mathpati

AGP for Respondent / State : Mrs. M.A. Deshpande
Advocate for Respondent No.4 : Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar

...

AND

997 WRIT PETITION NO.9514 OF 2021

JIJABRAO ATMARAM BAVISKAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Shivkumar K Mathpati
AGP for Respondent / State : Mr. S.B. Yawalkar
Advocate for Respondent Nos.5 & 6 : Mr. Avinash Aghav

...

AND

998 WRIT PETITION NO.9515 OF 2021

VITTHAL ANANDA SAWAKARE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Shivkumar K. Mathpati
AGP for Respondent / State : Mr. S.B. Yawalkar
Advocate for Respondent Nos.5 & 6 : Mr. Avinash Aghav

...

AND

999 WRIT PETITION NO.9516 OF 2021

SHAKILKHAN SULTANKHAN
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Shivkumar K. Mathpati
AGP for Respondent / State : Mr. S.B. Yawalkar
Advocate for Respondent Nos.5 & 6 : Mr. Avinash Aghav

...

AND

1000 WRIT PETITION NO.9517 OF 2021

SURYAKANT RAMBHAU JOGDAND AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Shivkumar K Mathpati
AGP for Respondent / State : Ms. R.P. Gour
Advocate for Respondent Nos.5 & 6 : Mr. P.D. Suryawanshi

...

AND

1002 WRIT PETITION NO.11885 OF 2021

NANDKISHOR VISHAWANTH POTARE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Estling S. Murge
AGP for Respondent / State : Mr. K.N. Lokhande
Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 & 3 : Mr. S.D. Kaldade

...

AND

**1004 WRIT PETITION NO.12426 OF 2021
WITH WP/12427/2021**

CHANDRASHEKAR H DONGAONKAR AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mrs. Suchia S. Upadhyaya Dhongade
AGP for Respondent / State : Mr. A.S. Shinde

...

AND

1035 WRIT PETITION NO.5647 OF 2021

SHIVAJI BAPURAO TAKLE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Shivkumar K Mathpati
AGP for Respondent / State : Ms. R.P. Gour
Advocate for Respondent Nos.5 & 6 : Mr. V.C. Patil h/f. Mr. U.B.
Bondar

...

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.11051 of 2021

PRADEEP KISHANRAO GODSE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Sandeep B. Sontakke
AGP for Respondent / State : Mrs. M.A. Deshpande
Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 & 3 : Mr. P.R. Tandale

...

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.14254 OF 2021

JITENDRA ATMARAM PAWAR AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Sandeep B. Sontakke
AGP for Respondent / State : Mrs. M.A. Deshpande
Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 & 3 : Mr. S.B. Munde

...

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &
SANDEEP V. MARNE, JJ.**

DATE : 06-10-2022

ORAL ORDER (PER SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.) :

. Some of the matters are not on board, but since the common issues are being considered and decided, those are taken on board.

2. Heard the learned Counsel appearing for the respective parties.
3. The issue involved in the present petitions is about grant of advance/additional increments for outstanding work vide Government Resolution dated 31.10.1989. It is the case of all the petitioners that on the basis of confidential reports of relevant time, they are entitled to be granted advance/additional increments, but the same were not extended on account of issuance of the Circular dated 03.07.2009 and the Government Resolution dated 24.08.2017.
4. The issue is no more *res-integra* and in various judgments of this Court, it has repeatedly been held that the Government Resolution dated 24.08.2017 would operate prospectively and would not have the effect of denial of advance increments prior to issuance thereof. The State Government and various Zilla Parishads had filed Review Petitions seeking review of various orders passed by this Court. It was *inter alia* sought to be contended in the said review petitions that even though the ultimate decision for stoppage of the scheme for advance increments might have been taken on 24.08.2017, it was earlier directed by way of Circular dated 03.07.2009 to undertake the exercise of pay fixation in 6th Pay Commission pay scales without taking into consideration the advance

increments.

5. We had the occasion to consider the entire issue in detail while deciding such review petitions. By judgment and order dated 30.08.2022, we have rejected the review petitions after considering all the objections raised by the State Government and Zilla Parishads. We have held that no specific instructions were issued before 24.08.2017 for discontinuation of the scheme of advance increments. We reproduce paragraph nos.12 to 15 of the judgment and order dated 30.08.2022 passed in Review Application (Civil) No.170 of 2022 in Writ Petition No.13760 of 2019 (The State of Maharashtra and Anr. Vs. Rupchand S/o. Narayan Shinde and Ors.):

‘12. After having heard learned Counsels at length, we find that the review applicants have not been able to point out any specific instructions issued prior to 24.08.2017 / 04.09.2018 for discontinuation of the schemes for grant of advance increments. Government Resolution dated 27.02.2009 and Circular dated 03.07.2009 do not indicate that any final decision was taken for discontinuation of schemes for advance increments. We proceed to examine the Government Resolution dated 27.02.2009 and Circular dated 03.07.2009 in details.

13. Government Resolution dated 27.02.2009 came to be issued by the State Government essentially for conveying the decision of the State Government about acceptance or otherwise of various recommendations made by the Hakim Committee constituted for implementation of recommendations of the 6th Central Pay Commission. In Annexure to the said Government Resolution, each recommendation and decision of the State Government thereon have been

enumerated. So far as the scheme for advance increment is concerned, the same is to be found at serial number 27 of the Annexure (para 3.24 of Committees Report). In that paragraph, the Committee recommended that for employees / Officers rendering outstanding service, increment @ 4% be awarded instead of 3% and such increment be granted once in 5 years. It was further recommended that since increment at higher rate was being granted, the then existing scheme for grant of one or two advance increments be discontinued. However, in the column 'Decision of State Government' against para 3.24, remark is made stating that 'separate action would be taken by General Administration Department'. As against various other recommendations, the remark 'accepted' has been made. The recommendation made in para 3.24 by the Hakim Committee was not accepted at least on the date of issuance of Government Resolution dated 27.02.2009 and General Administration Department was to take a decision thereon separately. Thus, it cannot be inferred that any specific decision was taken by the State Government on 27.02.2009 for discontinuation of scheme for grant of advance increment. Therefore, we do not find that the orders under review need to be disturbed on the basis of the Government Resolution dated 27.02.2009.

14. Now, we come to the Circular dated 03.07.2009. By the said Circular, it was directed that the issue of discontinuation of scheme for grant of advance increment was under consideration with the State Government and that some time was required for taking final decision. Therefore, it was further directed that temporarily the pay fixation of the employees in the 6th Pay Commission scales be made without considering the advance increments. Thus, the Circular dated 03.07.2009 was clearly issued as a temporary measure. The said circular did not communicate any decision to the effect that the State Government discontinued the scheme for grant of advance increments. Therefore, we find that the reliance of Mr. Dixit on the Circular dated 03.07.2009 is again of no avail.

15. We have carefully gone through the Government Resolution dated 24.08.2017 and Circular dated 04.09.2018. By the Government Resolution dated 24.08.2017, final decision came to be taken in respect of recommendation made by the Hakim Committee in para

3.24 of its report directing that during the period from 01.10.2006 to 01.10.2015 when revised pay scales as per 6th Pay Commission were admissible, the benefit of advance increments should not be granted. Thus, the final decision on para 3.24 of Committees Report was taken by the State Government only on 24.08.2017. However, instead of simply directing that the scheme for grant of advance increments is discontinued, the State Government sought to give retrospective effect to its decision by directing that the benefit of such advance increments be not given during the period from 01.10.2006 to 01.10.2015. While issuing such orders having retrospective effect, the State Government lost sight of the fact that several employees were already granted the benefit of advance increments during the relevant period. As we have observed earlier, the deliberations for discontinuation of the scheme started only on 27.02.2009 / 03.07.2009 and prior to that, admittedly, the issue of discontinuation of the scheme for grant of advance increment was not even under consideration. The instructions for temporarily doing pay fixation without advance increments were issued on 03.07.2009. This means that several employees must have already been granted advance increments during the period from 01.10.2006 to 03.07.2009. We, therefore, fail to comprehend as to how the State Government could have issued directions on 24.08.2017 that the benefit of advance increments should not be granted from 01.10.2006 onwards. Even in respect of employees becoming eligible for grant of advance increments after 27.02.2009, we do not find any error in the view taken by this Court that the Government Resolution dated 27.08.2017 would only have prospective effect.'

6. Thus, it is now a well settled position that the scheme of grant of advance increments was discontinued for the first time by Government Resolution dated 24.08.2017 and that such decision would operate only prospectively.

7. In view of the above, the Writ Petitions are allowed. The respondents are directed to consider the case of the petitioners for grant of advance / additional increments as per the Government Resolution dated 31.10.1989 and subsequent applicable Government Resolutions and Circulars. Their cases shall not be rejected only on the ground of Circular dated 03.07.2009 and Government Resolution dated 27.02.2009 or by applying Government Resolution dated 24.08.2017 retrospectively. If the petitioners are found eligible for grant of such increments, consequential monetary benefits be extended to them within a period of eight weeks from today.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)

...

GGP