

207

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

**CWP NO. 10482 of 2016 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 22.11.2022**

Saroj Kumari and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present : Ms. Sangeeta Dhanda, Advocate,
For the petitioners.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Rao, Advocate for
Mr. Anurag Goyal, Advocate,
For respondent No.3.

Mr. Jivesh Malik, Advocate for
Mr. Nupur Chaudhary, Advocate,
For respondents No.4 and 5.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

It is a classic case where employees of the State are suffering indignity of being treated as chattel having been tossed from one office to the other and what may be termed as perhaps 4th or 5th foray of *lis* before this Court, which includes as many as three contempt petitions filed by them seeking enforcement of the Court orders passed from time to time. Each time contemnors would purge themselves by paying the arrears of salary and then the petitioners out of their fear of not antagonizing employer in future for fear of being deprived of their salary

would withdraw the contempt petition. While on the other hand, this petition has remained pending ever since in view of the shifting stand taken by the respondents, as would be borne out from specific returns filed by the State government, Directorate of Social Justice and Empowerment vis-à-vis the stand taken by the Medical College, Rohtak as well as District Red Cross Society, Rohtak. More of it later.

2. Succinct facts first as pleaded in the petition.

3. In the return filed by respondent No.3-Medical College, Rohtak as well as respondent No.4-District Red Cross Society, Rohtak, an unambiguous stand has been taken that the petitioners are not their employees and hence the financial burden *qua* their salary and/or claim of regularization and other consequential benefits sought by them cannot be fastened on them. While on the other hand, contradictory stand has been taken by the State government as well as Directorate, Social Justice and Empowerment Department, that since appointment letters were issued by the Medical College, Rohtak, therefore, they are not their employees.

4. In order to clear the cobweb, it would be pertinent to go into the very genesis of setting up of the Scheme called “District Welfare Handicapped Centre”(hereinafter referred to as “Centre”), under which services of the petitioners were originally hired and continued to be so. Vide notification dated 21.07.1988 (Annexure P-1), three Committees were constituted for implementation and management of the aforesaid Scheme for which the Centre was initially set up at Medical College, Rohtak and one of the Committees was assigned the responsibility for selection and appointment of the staff, including recruitment of the petitioners herein. Pursuant thereto, petitioners were issued their respective appointment letters. Relevant Clause of the appointment from

one illustrative appointment letter of petitioner No.1-Saroj Kumari contained at Annexure P-2 (colly) is reproduced herein below:

“On the recommendation of the Employment Exchange you are hereby offered a post of Tailor in the pay scale of Rs. 950-20-1150-EB-25-1500 plus allowances as sanctioned by the Haryana Government from time adhoc basis for a period 89 days starting from your date of joining under the Scheme of District Handicapped Welfare Centre Rohtak.

2. You will be subject to Government Service Conduct Rules, 1996 as amended from time to time.”

xxx

11. Should you accept the above terms and conditions, you should present yourself immediately before the Chief Medical, Rohtak for Medical Examination to your fitness for first entry into Govt. service, if declared fit, you should report in this office alongwith other documents latest by 25.9.1987”.

5. Pursuant to their appointment, while the petitioners continued to work at the Centre and in the meantime, a regularization policy dated 27.05.1993 (Annexure P-4) was notified vide which services of the employees, who were eligible as on 31.03.1993, were to be regularized. Relevant extract thereof is reproduced here under:

“Work-Charged employees:-

The work-charged employees who have completed five or more years on continuous service as on 31st March, 1993, & were in service on 31st March, 93 shall be regularized. On regularization, these employees shall be liable for transfer in the State of Haryana on any project/work.”

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners would strenuously contend that had the case of petitioners been considered as on the cut-off date, they would have most certainly been granted the benefit of regularization on parity with others, who at the relevant time were regularized. She would further contend that in any case, it is not the case of petitioners that they were backdoor entrants since their appointments were made through proper channel i.e., Employment Exchange. She

would also contend that reliance placed in the impugned order upon *Secretary, State of Karnataka v. Uma Devi reported in 1979 (4) SCC 507*, to negate their claim for regularization, is totally misplaced. She contends that furthermore even vide subsequent regularization policy dated 18.03.1996 (Annexure P-5), they were equally eligible to be regularized, even then their case was not considered. She places reliance on Clause 2 of the policy which is reproduced herein below:

“2. This matter has further been considered and after careful consideration it has now been decided to regularize the services of all these work-Charged/ Casual/ Daily rated employees who have completed 3 years service on 31st Jan., 1996 and fulfill other conditions laid down in Haryana Govt. letter oven number dated 7th March, 1996.”

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners has also drawn my attention to the office letter dated 09.12.1996 (Annexure P-8) written by Head of the Department of Orthopedics, PGIMS, Rohtak addressed to the Director, PGIMS, whereby case of the petitioners was recommended for regularization followed by subsequent correspondence which reflects that the case of petitioners at the relevant time was under active consideration for regularization, as further information was being sought and exchanged *inter se*.

8. While on the one hand, their case was under active consideration, in the meanwhile as a bolt from the blue, vide an order dated 04.07.1997 (Annexure P-9), respondent No.2/Director, Social Justice and Empowerment Department, Chandigarh, directed the Principal of Medical College, Rohtak to transfer the entire Centres, which were being run by the Medical College to District Red Cross Society, Rohtak. The said order being of relevance, for ready reference is, reproduced herein below:

“Subject: Transfer of charge of Distt. Handicapped Welfare Centre, Rohtak, being run by the Medical College, Rohtak with the Assistance of grant-in-aid received from the Social Defence and Security Department.

Kindly refer to the matter noted above in the subject.

2. The Government while considering the representation of Sh. Ramesh Hooda, Ophthalmic Assistant, working in the Distt. Handicapped Welfare Centre, Rohtak, being run by the Medical College, Rohtak or his absorption in the Medical College, Rohtak, (have decided that he being the employees of District Handicapped Welfare Centre Funded through the Grant-in-Aid provided by the Social Defence & Security Department, Haryana cannot be absorbed in the Medical College Rohtak. To avoid any confusion amongst the employees regarding their service status in the centre, it has been decided to delink the District Handicapped Welfare Centre From Medical College, Rohtak and to handover to the District Red Cross Society Rohtak as per practice in District Red Cross Society in the State.

You are therefore, requested to please handover the control of District Handicapped welfare centre under to your charge to the Secretary District Red Cross Society Rohtak with complete details of assets and liabilities under intimation to this Department.

Endst. No. 5740/HW/SDS/97 Dated : the Chandigarh

A copy is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner cum President, District Red Cross Society, Rohtak with the request to please take over the charge of the Distt. Handicapped Welfare Centre, Rohtak, from District -cum-Principal, Medical College, Rohtak under intimation to this Department. The Social Defence and Security Department will continue to provide grant-in-aid for running of Distt. Handicapped Welfare Centre, as per norms.”

9. *Apropos, the aforesaid Centre along with its entire work force was transferred to District Red Cross Society and has been operational from there ever since. However, travails of the petitioners did not end here, rather got multiplied, inasmuch as while in Medical College they were atleast getting their salary, even though delayed, but after going to the Red Cross Society, while on the one hand work was taken from them, on the other hand, their salaries were stopped altogether. The*

petitioners aggrieved and in extreme financial distress, knocked at the doors of this Court vide CWP No. 16721 of 2011, which was disposed of vide an order dated 08.11.2012 (Annexure P-18). Speaking for this Court, R.K. Garg, J. (as he then was) observed as under:

“ All the petitioners had been originally appointed at the District Welfare Handicapped Centre run by the Social Defence and Security Department, Government of Haryana (now called as, 'Social Justice & Empowerment Department'). The said Centre was attached to the Government Medical College at Rohtak and when a request was made by the State to the Principal to absorb them, it was declined by him. Subsequently, it appears that the District Welfare Handicapped Centre itself was declined from Medical College, Rohtak and handed over to the District Red Cross Society. The proceedings dated 04.07.1997 specifically read that the Social Defence and Security Department would continue to provide grant-in-aid for running the Centre as per norms.

The petitioners had approached this Court earlier vide CWP No.17197 of 1997 for securing the usual allowances which were denied to them and a Division Bench of this Court directed the Government to pay all the allowances sanctioned by the Haryana Government from time to time.

In the instant writ petition, grievance of the petitioners is that the denial of allowances, which was set right by the directions of the Court, has now escalated to a much more serious problem of denial of salary itself from June 2011.

The State has filed its reply contending that the grant-in-aid for the year 2005-06 to 2011-12 partially defrayed the wages of the staff employed and there was no commitment of the Department to release grant-in-aid at 90% of the salaries paid to the staff of the District Welfare Handicapped Centre, Rohtak on regular pay scales applicable to Haryana Government employees. The Government refers to the formulation of its policy with effect from the financial year 2011-12 notified on 08.07.2011 that admits of a liability to reimburse the wages paid by these Centres in excess of the norms admissible under the Government of India's Din Dayal Disabled Rehabilitation Scheme in equal sharing ratio. The Director General of the Department has stated that the Government will make its allocations for reimbursement of wages paid in excess of the norms admissible under the scheme for rehabilitation of disabled persons.

From the aforesaid stand taken, it is crystal clear that the respondents are disputing their liability and in fact neither the State of Haryana nor respondents No.3 and 4 are admitting their liability towards the petitioners despite the fact that the Deputy Commissioner, Rohtak, being Chairman of the District Red Cross Society, has taken over the charge of the Social Defence and Security Department and has assumed charge of the District Handicapped Welfare Centre, Rohtak (of which the petitioners are the employees) in the year 1997, and in that capacity has continued to make payment of salaries to these employees. It is also not in dispute that even the State of Haryana had stepped into for granting pay-scales and usual allowances as being paid to the Government employees.

Now, this Court has failed to understand as to why the wages are being denied to the petitioners in spite of the fact that the work is being taken from them. It is not the case of any of the respondents that services of the petitioners have been terminated.

In these circumstances, it seems that the respondents cannot run away from their liability to make payment of salary to the petitioners.

It may further be noticed at this stage that the initial engagement of the petitioners has been on temporary basis but they have continued without break all these years. The primary liability shall be with the Government which has undertaken to pay the salaries at the time when the Centre was delinked from the Medical College and entrusted with the Red Cross Society. The Red Cross Society which secures service of the petitioners for providing assistance to the handicapped persons must also bear the responsibility for paying the salary, to the persons.

It shall be open to the respondents to formulate an appropriate scheme to provide for adequate funding that ensures disbursal of salary to all the persons employed at the Centre. The salary that remains payable from June 2011 shall forthwith be paid by the respondents No. 1 to 4. The liability shall be joint and several. The amount shall be paid within 2 weeks from today and the amounts payable every month shall also be released within the first seven days of every succeeding month.

It is further directed that unless the payment of the petitioners is made, the respondents shall not disburse any amount from the accounts of District Red Cross Society to any other expenditure.

Let the respondent-State make the payment in the first instance and thereafter the State is allowed to adjust the

same from the amounts of grant-in-aid etc. to be paid to the District Red Cross Society.

The writ petition is allowed in the above terms.”

10. Subsequently, the petitioners were though paid but once again there were inordinate delays from time to time in violation of the aforesaid orders passed by the learned Single Judge compelling them to file various contempt petitions time and again bearing COCP No.3535 of 2012, COCP No. 3148 of 2019, COCP No.1161 of 2021.

11. While on one hand, petitioners have been knocking at the doors of this Court time and again to get their salaries, on the other hand, having exhausted themselves were compelled to cause legal notice dated 27.03.2015 (Annexure P-22). Responding to the legal notice, impugned order dated 05.05.2016 (Annexure P-24) has been passed by the Director, Social Justice and Empowerment Department-respondent No.2 herein, relevant part whereof, for ready reference is reproduced herein below:

“Accordingly, at this stage, without commenting on the merits of the case, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2 to take a decision on the legal notice dated 27.03.2015 (Annexure P-7), issued by the learned counsel for the petitioners, by passing a speaking order and after affording opportunity to hearing to the petitioners, preferable within four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Needless to add that the decision so taken be communicated to the petitioners and if the decision is not to the satisfaction of the petitioners and if the decision is not to the satisfactory of the petitioners, they would be at liberty to challenge the same, in accordance with law.”

In compliance of the aforesaid order dated 07.09.2015, the legal notice dated 27.03.2015 of the petitioners has been perused. Notices were issued for personal hearing to Ms. Saroj Kumari, Bhagat Singh, Bimal Lohchab, Balwant Singh and Jai Parkash through registered post vide this department letter No. 16875-79 dated 28.04.2016 and also through personal service through their employer District Red Cross Society, Rohtak. These notices were issued in compliance to

the aforesaid Hon'ble Court orders in order to afford personal hearing with respect to their claims in the said legal notice dated 27.03.2015.

All the petitioners had come present for hearing on 05.05.2016. During personal hearing, the petitioners stated that they are working continuously without any break despite the fact that they were appointed during the year 1987 to 1990, but their regularization and consequential benefit of regularization was not given to them so they are unable to get retiral benefits like pension, gratuity, leave encashment, GIS etc.

They further stated that they were appointed by Medical College, Rohtak and appointment orders were issued by Director-Principal, Medical College, Rohtak and the clause was mentioned in their appointment letters that they would not be entitled for GPF/CPF, pension, gratuity, medical reimbursement, LTC etc. since they were unemployed, so having no other choice of employment, they joined Medical College, Rohtak in accordance with the appointment letters. Thereafter, in 1997, for the sake of uniformity, among all the districts, their services were handed over to District Red Cross Society, Rohtak and all assets and liabilities of District Handicapped Welfare Centre were also handed over. However, Social Defence and Security Department, which was predecessor of this department, continued to provide grant-in-aid to the Red Cross Society, Rohtak but they claim that overall control remained with the department. They also asserted that once they have been given consolidated salary in regular pay scale in violation of terms and conditions of the appointment letter issued to them at the time of initial appointment in Medical College, Rohtak, and the Hon'ble Court ordered that they granted the pay scale plus all usual allowances as sanctioned by the Government from time to time. They also claimed that they are getting salary out of the funds of the State Government and also got the benefit of revision of pay scales from time to time. When they could not get their salaries for a number of months in 2011 due to cut imposed on the amount of grant-in-aid, then they were forced to file another case in the Hon'ble Court and the Hon'ble Court directed the State Government to reimburse their salaries and adjust it against it against grant-in- aid. Further they stated that their cases for regularization were not considered while they were eligible for regularization since 1993. Further they requested that there would be no financial burden as they are getting regular pay scales. They contended that the scheme where they are working is permanent in nature and as per appointment letters issued to them at the time of appointment are Government employees. They pointedly explained that due to conditions of appointment letters they were denied pension and other retiral benefits. Further they requested that they are at the

fag end of their carrier and they could not get benefit of 1st, 2nd and 3rd ACP which caused them huge financial losses so they requested regularization from back date or from any other date which the department deems fit.

The officials of the Red Cross Society, Rohtak present in the hearing also presented relevant record. The record pertaining to their appointments and grants granted to the society was also presented by the Deputy Director (DW) and Administrative Officer of the Department.

After perusing of the record of the above mentioned persons of careful consideration, it is clear that there are several contradictions and patently wrong assertions in the legal notice, which is being decided here as under:

These persons have themselves stated that they have no other option but to join District Handicapped Welfare Centre in Medical College, Rohtak because they did not have any other meaningful notice and they joined their duties subject to the conditions as laid down in their appointment letters. They have also asserted that while filing CWP No. 17197 of 1997 in the Hon'ble High Court, the same terms and conditions of appointment letters were challenged and on 05.05.1999 the Hon'ble Court granted relief for the payment of all the allowances sanctioned by Government. According to the officials of the society, they further utilized the aforesaid judgment/decision in another Writ Petition during the year 2012, and they got payment of their salaries on first priority from the accounts of District Red Cross Society.

On the basis of appointment letters and in consequence to Hon'ble Court's judgment of 1999 regarding payment of usual allowances, they also got enhancement in pay scales. But now they are disputing the condition of same appointment letters by saying that nonpayment of GPF/CPF, pension, gratuity, medical reimbursement, LTC is wrongly mentioned in the appointment letter.

A brief perusal of appointment letters shows that all the appointment letters clearly mention that they were not entitled to pension, GPF, Gratuity etc. benefits. It was also specifically written in Bhagat Singh, Balwant Singh and Bimla Lohchab that they will not be governed under Punjab Civil Services Rules. Having accepted their appointment in between 1987 to 1990, with all its terms and conditions, because of admittedly lack of choice, and having remained silent for nearly 20-25 years, they cannot dispute the terms and conditions of their appointment letters when they were using same appointment letter to get various benefits from the Hon'ble Court. They cannot be allowed to use terms and conditions of appointment letters when it is convenient to them and dispute the appointment letters when it is

convenient to them. Further it is beyond limitation to dispute appointment letters after 20-25 years of acceptance.

Further their stand for seeking regularization from Social Justice and Empowerment Department is also contradictory as they are claiming themselves as employees of the department. In fact they were employees of Medical College, Rohtak and, thereafter, employees of District Red Cross Society, Rohtak. Their appointment letters never shows them as employees of the department. In Civil Writ Petition No. 10184 of 2015, same persons have attached Annexure P-6 addressed to Chief Minister, Haryana where, through their family members, cleverly claimed that they are the employees of PGIMS, Rohtak even though scheme was partly financed in the form of grant-in-aid through Social Justice and Empowerment Department. Date is not written by the Advocate, but since they claim working in District Handicapped Welfare Centre for the last 17-18 years, and their date of joining is from 1987 to 1990, so it can be inferred that the date of application can be approximately around the year 2005 to 2007. But now through legal notice they are contradicting by claiming to be the employees of the department.

Further it needs to be understood that how they are claiming to be employees of the department. Their appointment letters were not issued by the department. It was issued by Medical College, Rohtak. The correspondence of Employment Exchange for suitable names was not made by the department but by Medical College, Rohtak. Their joining was also accepted by Medical College, Rohtak. The Department liabilities were only to pay grant-in-aid to the Medical College, Rohtak and subsequently in the later years to the Red Cross Society, Rohtak and the payment is on scheme basis and grant-in-aid was made available to Medical College, Rohtak and then subsequently to Red Cross Society, Rohtak. They either hired or retained certain employees as deemed fit for the running of the scheme. These persons were never on pay roll of the department. For all other employees of the department, who are either regular or adhoc employees, the payment used to be made directly from Treasury to employees without payment to any intermediate organization which is not the case here. Further department does not maintain Service Book of these employees. Neither disciplinary matters, leave applications etc. are handled by the department. Even grant-in-aid also covers partly the salary of these persons as some part of their salary needs to be contributed by the Society, being their employer. Neither any extension of their service is approved by the department. Record reveals that even pay fixation is conducted by Red Cross Society and not by the department. The Red Cross Society is neither the State Government nor the

instrumentality of State. This is an independent voluntary organization.

They also made totally incorrect assertion that no burden is likely to be borne by regularizing (para 13 of legal notice). In fact they contradicted this para 20 of the legal notice in question by stating that they are suffering huge financial loss due to non-regularization and consequential loss of 1st 2nd 3rd ACP as well as right to pension, gratuity, leave, encashment and other retiral benefits.

If the absurd logic of any employee such as petitioners, in their legal notice is accepted, then this department and other departments giving grant-in-aid to thousands of non-governmental organizations, which utilized part of grant-in-aid for salary, then all such lakhs of non-government employees has to be considered as Government employees, only for regularizing their services which is simply the most unreasonable logic, one can artificially manufacture.

It is also totally incorrect to say that scheme is permanent in nature. It was revealed that hardly any work is performed by these employees. Similar service is available from PGIMS. Many districts do not have similar scheme. There is nothing to rule that scheme is permanent in nature. They also attained superannuation age from centre and did not get replaced by hiring another staff.

The appointment between Medical College, Rohtak and these persons, and subsequently after transfer of employees, assets and liabilities, between Red Cross and these employees can never be considered as contract between this department and Red Cross employees. Further appointment is not a contract signed by both the parties with details of their commitment and considerations. Even Section 23 of the Contract Act only talks about any object or consideration which is forbidden by law. Hiring an employee in a scheme, by the Medical College, Rohtak and continuing them by Red Cross, is certainly neither an illegal activity, nor forbidden by law, nor immoral, nor opposed to public policy, nor defeating the provisions of any law, nor injury to person or property of anybody. So out of context and just to confuse, contract argument is raised, which is totally inapplicable there.

Further Constitutional Bench judgment in Secretary, State of Karnataka Versus Uma Devi, clearly ruled that temporary employee cannot say that he has an enforceable legal right to be permanently absorbed or the State has legal duty to make them permanent. Besides, there is nothing on the record to show that the petitioners were appointed through the constitutional scheme.

The question of regularization does not arise as Government can regularize only its own employees and it cannot regularize employees of other non-governmental organizations, even though part of the salary is paid by utilizing grant-in-aid given to those organizations.

Therefore, these persons failed to prove that they are employees of department. Record shows them as employees of Medical College, Rohtak and, thereafter, employees of District Red Cross Society, Rohtak. So they are pursuing their legal notice before wrong authority. Even their stand on appointment letter, regularization, financial burden etc. is also contradictory as explained above. Therefore, the department is unable to provide any relief to them. Hence, the claim of the petitioners in their legal notice dated 27.03.2015 stands rejected.”

12. Petitioners are before this Court assailing the aforesaid orders of declining their claim for regularization.

13. In the return filed, stand has been taken defending the reasons given in the impugned order, which have already been reproduced herein above.

14. I have heard the competing contentions of learned counsels for the parties, which are more or less on the same lines as is the case pleaded by them in the writ petition as well as in the returns filed thereto. I shall now proceed to deal with the same and render my opinion in the succeeding paragraphs.

15. First and foremost, let us see if there is any substance in the stand taken by the respondent-State that the petitioners are employees of Medical College, Rohtak, since appointment letters have been issued by the Director of the College. On the first flush, it does seem that since the issuing authority for the appointment of the petitioners is Principal, Medical College, Rohtak, therefore, the College cannot wash its hands of its responsibility being the appointing authority. However, a deeper scrutiny of the entirety of the record reflects otherwise. As already noted

in the factual narrative, appointment letters were issued pursuant to the selection made by the Committee constituted vide notification Annexure P-1 of which Additional Director, Social Welfare, Haryana, was an equal constituent. The notification clearly states that the Committee has been constituted to make recruitments for implementation and management of the Scheme called District Handicapped Welfare Centre, to be set up at the Medical College, Rohtak. It was in this background that the petitioners were though employed for the Scheme, but since they were to be physically located and deputed in the Centres, which were to be set up in the Medical College that the Director, Medical College, Rohtak was delegated the administrative authority of issuing appointment letters being the constituent of the Selection Committee itself. Furthermore, the stand taken by the State flies in the face of order dated 04.07.1997 (Annexure P-9), which has been issued by the respondent No.2 asking the Principal of Medical College to shift the entire centre from Medical College to District Red Cross Society. If it were to be believed, as has been canvassed and pleaded that the petitioners were not employees of the Medical College, then how it was within the administrative domain of Director of Social Justice and Empowerment Department-respondent No.2 to issue a command to the Director, Medical College, to transfer entire centre along with its employees. The Director of Medical College was naturally too willing to abide by the said office letter since he was conscious that the petitioners are not employees of the Medical College and they were merely deputed in the Centre which had been set up in the College. Accordingly, I find no fault with the stand taken by the Medical College in the pleadings as well as in the course of arguments that petitioners are not their employees.

16. As regards claim of the petitioners, I do find merit in the contentions of learned counsel for the petitioners that their case could not have been rejected on the ground that they are back door entrants. The appointment letter itself is self-explanatory and a bare perusal of the same reflects that their services were engaged through proper channel.

17. In the premise, the impugned order dated 05.05.2016 (Annexure P-24) is hereby set-aside. The case is remanded back to respondent No.2/Director, Social Justice and Empowerment Department, Chandigarh, to pass fresh orders in the light of findings given by this Court herein above that the petitioners at all time were employees of respondent No.2/Director. Needless to say that in case the petitioners are found eligible in terms of the applicable regularization policies, they shall be accorded benefit in terms thereof.

18. On a Court query, learned counsel for the petitioners has been very fair and has candidly made a statement at bar that in case the benefit of regularization is given, they are willing to forego their claim for ACP. As regards pay-scale, since the salaries have been paid as per the admissible pay-scales from time to time under orders of this Court, there are unlikely to be any arrears to be paid.

19. The needful exercise be carried out within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

NOVEMBER 22, 2022
Shalini

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No