IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH AT GWALIOR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE ANAND PATHAK

ON THE 2nd OF FEBRUARY, 2024

WRIT PETITION No. 2654 of 2024

BETWEEN:-

1. **KAMAL SINGH S/O SHRI LAL SINGH (S.N. 47)., AGED 59 YEARS, OCCUPATION: SERVICE OFFICE OF P.W.D. DEPARTMENT SUB DIVISION GUNA DIVISION GUNA DISTRICT GUNA (M.P.) (MADHYA PRADESH)**

2. **BALA PRASAD S/O SHRI TULARAM SHARMA (S.N. 164), AGED 53 YEARS, OCCUPATION: SERVICE, OFFICE OF P.W.D. DEPARTMENT SUB DIVISION GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

3. **KEHAR SINGH S/O SHRI JAGNATH (SN 56), AGED 54 YEARS, OCCUPATION: SERVICE, OFFICE OF P.W.D. DEPARTMENT SUB DIVISION GUNA DIVISION GUNA DISTRICT GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

4. **PARMAL S/O SHRI ARJUN (SN 77), AGED 48 YEARS, OCCUPATION: SERVICE, OFFICE OF P.W.D. DEPARTMENT SUB DIVISION GUNA DIVISION GUNA DISTRICT GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

5. **LAXMINARAYAN S/O SHRI KALYAN (SN 42), AGED 58 YEARS, OCCUPATION: SERVICE, OFFICE OF P.W.D. DEPARTMENT SUB DIVISIO GUNA, DIVISION GUNA DISTRICT GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

6. **ASHARAM S/O SHRI RAM KISHAN (SN 127), AGED 47 YEARS, OCCUPATION: SERVICE, OFFICE OF P.W.D. DEPARTMENT SUB DIVISION GUNA DISTRICT GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONER

(BY SHRI K.K. SHRIVASTAVA- ADVOCATE)

AND

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: VISHAL UPADHYAY
Signing time: 05-02-2024 11:26:05 AM

1. **THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH PRINCIPAL SECRETARY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, MANTRALAYA, VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL MP (MADHYA PRADESH)**

2. **ENGINEER IN CHIEF PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 27-28 NIRMAN BHAWAN, BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**

3. **CHIEF ENGINEER (NORTH) PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT GWALIOR (MADHYA PRADESH)**

4. **SUPERINTENDENT ENGINEER PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT CIRCLE GUNA DISTRICT GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

5. **EXECUTIVE ENGINEER PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT DIVISION GUNA, DISTRICT GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI N.S. TOMAR- GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE FOR RESPONDENT/STATE)

This petition coming on for admission this day, the court passed the following:

ORDER

The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution prays for the following reliefs:-

> *"(i) That, a direction may kindly be given to the respondents to give the benefit of regular/minimum pay scale of the post on which the petitioners are working and classified as permanent employees as w.e.f. 24.04.2013 and pay the difference of arrears on fixation of pay from the date of classification along with interest at the rate of 18% p.a. as per the law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Ramnaresh Rawat (supra).*
>
> *(ii) That, the respondents may kindly be directed to regularize the services of the petitioner and make the member of GPF;*

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: VISHAL UPADHYAY
Signing time: 05-02-2024 11:26:05 AM

(iii) Cost of this petition may kindly be awarded; and

iv) Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court deem fit in the facts and circumstances of the case may kindly be granted to the petitioner."

It is the case of the petitioners that they are appointed as daily wage employees in the respondents/Department as Labour. Counsel for the Petitioners submits that despite having been classified as permanent employees under the M.P. Industrial Employment (Standing Order) Act 1961 only benefit of regular pay scale has been extended to them as per the policy dated 7.10.2016. It is submitted that they are claiming classification benefit prior to implementation of the policy. He submits that the classification order of the petitioners is still intact and has not been cancelled by the authorities at any point of time. The law in regard to the benefits flowing from an order of classification is now settled in view of the decision of Apex Court in the case of **Ram Naresh Rawat Vs. Ashwini Ray reported in 2017 (Vol 3) SCC 436**, relevant extract of which is reproduced below for convenience and ready reference:

"4..... The precise submission is that once they are conferred the status of permanent employee by the court and it is also categorically held that they are entitled to regular pay attached to the said post, not only the pay should be fixed in the regular payscale, the petitioners would also be entitled to the increments and other emoluments attached to the said post. 18. Insofar as petitioners before us are concerned they have been classified as 'permanent'. For this reason, we advert to the core issue, which would determine the fate of these cases, viz., whether these employees can be treated as 'regular' employees in view of the aforesaid classification? In

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: VISHAL UPADHYAY
Signing time: 05-02-2024 11:26:05 AM

other words, with their classification as 'permanent', do they stand regularized in service?

26. From the aforesaid, it follows that though a 'permanent employee' has right to receive pay in the graded pay- cale, at the same time, he would be getting only minimum of the said payscale with no increments. It is only the regularization in service which would entail grant of increments etc in the pay-scale.

27. In view of the aforesaid, we do not find any substance in the contentions raised by the petitioners in these contempt petitions. We are conscious of the fact that in some cases, on earlier occasions, the State Government while fixing the pay scale, granted increments as well. However, if some persons are given the benefit wrongly, that cannot form the basis of claiming the same relief. It is trite that right to equality under Article 14 is not in negative terms (See Indian Council of Agricultural Research & Anr. v. T.K. Suryanarayan & Ors.9).

28. These contempt petitions are, accordingly, dismissed.

Counsel for respondents is having no objection to the innocuous prayer made by the counsel for the petitioners.

In view of the above and considering the statement made by the counsel for the petitioners, it is directed that the petitioners will submit separate representation to the competent authority and in turn, the competent authority is directed to dwell upon the same and decide the same, subject to verification that the order of classification of the petitioners is not cancelled at any point of time, by passing a speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Arrears if any be worked out, as a necessary consequence and be paid to the petitioner within a further period of

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: VISHAL UPADHYAY
Signing time: 05-02-2024 11:26:05 AM

two months.

With the aforesaid direction, petition stands **disposed of** with no order as to the cost.

(ANAND PATHAK)
JUDGE

Vishal

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: VISHAL UPADHYAY
Signing time: 03-02-2024 11:26:05 AM