



W.P.No.1011 of 2021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 11.09.2023

Coram

**The Hon'ble Mr.Justice D.Krishnakumar
and
The Hon'ble Mr.Justice P.B.Balaji**

W.P.No.1011 of 2021

C.B.Madana Manoharan
s/o. C.K.Balakrishna Reddy
Joint Controller (Rtd.,)
D-5, Sumangala Flats,
38-41, Venugopalapuram
Palavanthangal, Chennai – 600 114.

..Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Registrar,
Central Administrative Tribunal,
Madras Bench, High Court Complex,
Chennai – 600 105.
2. The Director General Quality Assurance,
Room No.308, A, D-1 Wing, Sena Bhavan,
New Delhi – 110 011.
3. The Secretary to the Government of India,
Ministry of Defence, Department of Defence Production,
Room No.136, South Block,
New Delhi – 110 011.

..Respondents



W.P.No.1011 of 2021

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for records of the first respondent, in O.A./310/00205/2020, dated 17.02.2020, and to quash the said order and consequently, to direct the respondents to grant annual increment to the petitioner; to treat the retirement date of the petitioner as on 01.07.2007, and to grant him all the consequential benefits including the pensionary benefits.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Ayyamperumal
For Respondent-1 : Tribunal
For Respondents 2 & 3 : Mr.S.Diwakar
Senior Panel Counsel

ORDER

This Writ Petition is filed seeking to quash the order passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal (for short, the 'Tribunal') whereby, claim of the petitioner to pay notional increment on completion of service was rejected, and consequently, to direct the respondents to grant annual increment to the petitioner and to treat the retirement date of the petitioner as 01.07.2007 and to grant him all consequential benefits including the pensionary benefits.



W.P.No.1011 of 2021

2. We have heard Mr.P.Ayyam Perumal, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.S.Diwakar, learned Senior Panel Counsel for respondents 2 and 3.

3. The learned counsels appearing on either side do not dispute the fact that the issue involved in these Writ Petitions is covered by a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme in the case of **Director (Admin. And HR) KPTCL and others Vs. C.P.Mundinamani and others**) reported in **2021 SCC Online SC 401**, wherein, the issue as to whether an employee, who has earned annual increment is entitled to receive same despite the fact that he has retired on the very next day of earning the increment is decided in favour of the employees. For better appreciation, the relevant para of the said decision is extracted hereinbelow:-

“20 Similar view has also been expressed by different High Courts, namely, the Gujarat High Court, the Madhya Pradesh High Court, the Orissa High Court and the Madras High Court. As observed hereinabove, to interpret Regulation 40(1) of the Regulations in the



WEB COPY



W.P.No.1011 of 2021

manner in which the appellants have understood and/or interpreted would lead to arbitrariness and denying a government servant the benefit of annual increment which he has already earned while rendering specified period of service with good conduct and efficiently in the last preceding year. It would be punishing a person for no fault of him. As observed hereinabove, the increment can be withheld only by way of punishment or he has not performed the duty efficiently. Any interpretation which would lead to arbitrariness and/or unreasonableness should be avoided. If the interpretation as suggested on behalf of the appellants and the view taken by the Full Bench of the Andhra Pradesh High Court is accepted, in that case it would tantamount to denying a government servant the annual increment which he has earned for the services he has rendered over a year subject to his good behaviour. The entitlement to receive increment therefore crystallises when the government servant completes requisite length of service with good conduct and becomes payable on the succeeding day. In the present case the word “accrue” should be understood liberally and would mean payable on the succeeding day. Any contrary view would lead to arbitrariness and unreasonableness and denying a government servant legitimate one annual increment though he is entitled to for rendering the services over a year with good



WEB COPY



W.P.No.1011 of 2021

behaviour and efficiently and therefore, such a narrow interpretation should be avoided. We are in complete agreement with the view taken by the Madras High Court in the case of P. Ayyamperumal (supra); the Delhi High Court in the case of Gopal Singh (supra); the Allahabad High Court in the case of Nand Vijay Singh (supra); the Madhya Pradesh High Court in the case of Yogendra Singh Bhadauria (supra); the Orissa High Court in the case of AFR Arun Kumar Biswal (supra); and the Gujarat High Court in the case of Takhatsinh Udesinh Songara (supra). We do not approve the contrary view taken by the Full Bench of the Andhra Pradesh High Court in the case of Principal Accountant-General, Andhra Pradesh (supra) and the decisions of the Kerala High Court in the case of Union of India Vs. Pavithran (O.P.(CAT) No. 111/2020 decided on 22.11.2022) and the Himachal Pradesh High Court in the case of Hari Prakash Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. (CWP No. 2503/2016 decided on 06.11.2020).

21. In view of the above and for the reasons stated above, the Division Bench of the High Court has rightly directed the appellants to grant one annual increment which the original writ petitioners earned on the last day of their service for rendering their services



preceding one year from the date of retirement with good behaviour and efficiently. We are in complete agreement with the view taken by the Division Bench of the High Court. Under the circumstances, the present appeal deserves to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed. However, in the facts and circumstances of the case, there shall be no order as to costs."

4. Further, following the said decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the above referred case, (viz.in **KPTCL**) this Bench also allowed a Writ Petition involving identical issue in the case of **T.Mani and three others Vs. Union of India rep. By its Director General of Posts and four others**) in W.P.No.176 of 2019, dated 05.07.2023.

5. Thus, in the light of the aforesaid decision of the Honourable Supreme Court, in the case of **KPTCL (cited supra)**, we are of the view that the present Writ Petition is also liable to be allowed on the same lines.



W.P.No.1011 of 2021

6. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is allowed, the impugned order passed by the Tribunal is set aside and consequently, the respondents 2 and 3 are directed to grant annual increment to the petitioner for the service rendered by him in the preceding year and treat the retirement date of the petitioner as 01.07.2007 and grant him all consequential benefits including the pensionary benefits within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

D.K.K.J., & P.B.B.J.,

11.09.2023

sd

Index :Yes/No

Neutral Citation : yes/no

Note : Issue order copy on 02.11.2023

B/o sd dt.01.11.2023

To

1. The Registrar,
Central Administrative Tribunal,
Madras Bench, High Court Complex,
Chennai – 600 105.
2. The Director General Quality Assurance,
Room No.308, A, D-1 Wing, Sena Bhavan,
New Delhi – 110 011.
3. The Secretary to the Government of India,
Ministry of Defence, Department of Defence Production,



WEB COPY



W.P.No.1011 of 2021

Room No.136, South Block, New Delhi – 110 011.

D.Krishnakumar,J.
&
P.B.Balaji,J.,
sd

W.P.No.1011 of 2021

11.09.2023