



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.1321 of 2019

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 30.03.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

W.P.(MD)No.1321 of 2019

R.Vellappan Asari

... Petitioner

vs.

1.The Managing Director,
The Tamil Nadu State Transport
Corporation (Tirunelveli) Limited,
Kattapomman Nagar,
Tirunelveli 627 011.

2.The General Manager,
The Tamil Nadu State Transport
Corporation (Tirunelveli) Limited,
Nagercoil Region,
Tirunelveli.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent in his



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.1321 of 2019

order no. Thani / Sapapi 2 / Tha.A.Po.Ka(Thili) / 2016, dated 21.02.2017 and to quash the same and consequently, to direct the respondents to pay the difference amount of encashment of earned leave based on the revised scale of pay as per the VI pay commission report.

For Petitioner : M/s.D.Ramya
for Mr.C.Thangamani
For Respondents : Mr.K.Sathiya Singh

ORDER

This writ petition is filed for writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to quash the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent, dated 21.02.2017 and consequently, to direct the respondents to pay the difference amount of encashment of earned leave based on the revised scale of pay as per the VI pay commission report.

2.The petitioner was working as Assistant Manager and retired from service on 31.05.2009. The Government issued revised scale of pay



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.1321 of 2019

and allowances for the Government employees with effect from 01.01.2006 through G.O.Ms.Nos.234 and 236, Finance (PC) Department, dated 01.06.2009. The respondent Corporation has also extended the same revision, vide G.O.Ms.No.63, Transport (D) Department, dated 05.02.2010. The said G.O., has given revision retrospectively from 01.01.2006. Therefore, the petitioner being in managerial cadre is seeking the benefits of G.O.Ms.No.63, Transport (D) Department, dated 05.02.2010.

3. The 2nd respondent has filed a counter affidavit stating that in the impugned order, it has been clearly stated that the leave salary payable to the petitioner was calculated based on the last drawn salary at the time of retirement of the petitioner. The counter affidavit also states that as per G.O.Ms.No.63, Transport (D) Department, dated 05.02.2010, the entire benefits was settled. Therefore, the 2nd respondent prays to dismiss the writ petition.



WEB COPY




W.P.(MD)No.1321 of 2019

4. Heard M/s.D.Ramya, learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.K.Sathiya Singh, learned Counsel appearing for the respondents and perused the records.

5. In the counter affidavit, the respondents have not denied that the petitioner is not entitled to revision as per G.O.Ms.No.63. The counter affidavit The counter affidavit is not clear and the respondents have not stated whether the benefits of Earned Leave was disbursed to the petitioner based on G.O.Ms.No.63 because the said G.O., was issued after the retirement of the petitioner, i.e., the petitioner retired on 31.07.2009 whereas the G.O., was issued on 05.02.2010. Moreover, the G.O.Ms.No.63 has given retrospective effect for the revision of pay from 01.01.2006.

6. Therefore the impugned order is quashed. From 01.01.2006



7. With the above said observation, the writ petition is allowed. No

30.03.2023
(4/4)

Tmg



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.1321 of 2019

S.SRIMATHY, J

Tmg

W.P.(MD)No.1321 of 2019

30.03.2023
(4/4)