



2024:DHC:5533



\$~119

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

%

Date of Decision: 18th July, 2024

+ W.P.(C) 6517/2019

BIMLA VIRMANI

.....Petitioner

Through: Dr. L.C. Singhi, Advocate

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal and Mr.
Hardik Rupal, Advocates for R-1.Mr. Santosh Kumar and Mr. Adithya Ramani,
Advocates for R-2.

Mr. Ravinder Agarwal, Advocate for R-3.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH****JUDGMENT****JYOTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

1. This writ petition has been preferred on behalf of the Petitioner under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs:-

“(a) Issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other Writ or Writs to the Respondents for grant of STUM/ 2nd ACP to the Petitioner with effect from 02.01.1998 instead of 09.08.1999 in terms of Executive Council Resolution No. 101 dated 23.08.2001 in terms of Executive Council Resolution No. 101 of 23.08.2001, UGC D.O. No. F.31-8/97(CU) DATED 25.06.2002, and letter No.F.41-5/2003(JCRC) dated 14/07/2010 & MHRD F.No.4-35-Desk(U) Dt. 18/01/2016 giving her parity/similar treatment with other employees of Delhi University/Colleges; and

(b)To direct the Respondents to pay all consequential benefits in Pay and Pension and all arrears along with interest @18% per annum; and

(c) To direct Respondents to pay the costs of this petition; and

(d)To Grant such other relief/reliefs as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper to grant; AND



2024:DHC:5533



for this act of kindness, your humble petitioner, as in duty bound shall ever pray.”

2. As per the factual narrative in the writ petition, Petitioner was appointed as Junior Library Assistant (‘JLA’) in Vivekananda College, Delhi University vide order dated 20.10.1975 in the pay scale of Rs.260-400 plus other allowances and joined on 27.10.1975. On completion of probation period, Petitioner was confirmed vide order dated 07.12.1976 from the date of her initial appointment.

3. Petitioner was granted One Time Upward Movement (‘OTUM’) w.e.f. 02.01.1986 in the pay scale of Rs.1350-2200 and was given revised pay scale of Rs.1400-2300 w.e.f. 02.01.1986 notionally, in terms of decision of the Executive Council dated 09.03.1991, as approved by the University vide letter dated 28.05.1997. On implementation of 5th Central Pay Commission’s (‘CPC’) recommendations, Petitioner was placed in the pay scale of Rs.4500-7000 w.e.f. 01.01.1996 and as per the Petitioner, University accorded its approval for grant of Second Time Upward Movement (‘STUM’) in favour of the Petitioner w.e.f. 02.01.1998 in the pay scale of Rs.5500-9000, after completion of 12 years from the date of OTUM in terms of Executive Council (‘EC’) Resolution dated 23.08.2001.

4. Petitioner avers that Department of Personnel & Training (‘DoPT’) introduced the Assured Career Progression Scheme (‘ACP’) vide O.M. dated 09.08.1999 and the EC of the University in its meeting held on 23.08.2001 accorded approval for implementation of the Scheme from 08.04.1998. However, for those who had received OTUM before 08.04.1998, it was consciously decided that second upgradation will be on completion of 12 years from the date of first upward movement. It is averred



2024:DHC:5533



that in furtherance thereof, University issued a general circular dated 28.06.2002 for release of STUM to those who had received OTUM before 08.04.1998. It is averred that having been granted OTUM w.e.f. 02.01.1986, Petitioner became entitled to STUM w.e.f. 02.01.1998 in the pay scale of Rs.5500-9000 and accordingly, College moved a proposal in favour of the Petitioner and the University in response thereto, accorded approval vide letter dated 11.12.2003.

5. Despite this, Petitioner was granted STUM only from 09.08.1999 vide the impugned order dated 10.05.2007 and not from 02.01.1998. It is stated that on 01.09.2008, University accorded approval for grant of 3rd MACP w.e.f. 01.09.2008 and for fixation of pay at Rs.15,720/- in PB-II (Rs.9300-34800) with Grade Pay Rs.4600/-. Petitioner was promoted as Semi Professional Assistant ('SPA') w.e.f. August 2010, without any financial benefits. On 14.07.2010, UGC sent a letter to the University confirming EC Resolution dated 23.08.2001 and re-stated that STUM will be given after 12 years from the date of OTUM to those who received OTUM before 08.04.1998. Petitioner superannuated on 31.01.2011 and thereafter made a representation to the College on 15.05.2012 for rectification of her pay and grant of STUM from 02.01.1998.

6. Office Order was issued on 13.07.2012 by the College re-fixing Petitioner's pay under STUM from 09.08.1999 overlooking the fact that 09.08.1999 was the date when ACP was introduced, which had nothing to do with the grant of STUM. College, vide its letter dated 03.05.2013, again recommended the case of the Petitioner favourably enclosing a copy of the EC Resolution but the University persisted in its stand and rejected the proposal on 30.07.2013. On representations being made by the Petitioner,



2024:DHC:5533



correspondence was exchanged between the College, University, UGC and Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), but no relief was given to the Petitioner and she approached this Court by filing the present writ petition.

7. Learned counsel for the Petitioner contends that EC Resolution No.101 dated 23.08.2001 is applicable to the case of the Petitioner and provides that STUM will be granted after completion of 12 years from the date of grant of OTUM to those who were given OTUM before 08.04.1998. Admittedly, Petitioner was granted OTUM on 28.05.1997 w.e.f. 02.01.1986 in the pay scale of Rs.1350-2200, which was prior to 08.04.1998 and was thus eligible for grant of STUM w.e.f. 02.01.1998 on completion of 12 years of service from 02.01.1986.

8. It is further submitted that University approved the grant of STUM from 02.01.1998 vide letter dated 09/11.12.2003 in terms of EC Resolution dated 23.08.2001 and UGC had also accorded approval vide letter dated 14.07.2010, however, STUM was granted only from 09.08.1999, which was wholly erroneous and contrary to EC Resolution dated 23.08.2001 and the decisions of University and UGC taken earlier.

9. Learned counsel alleges discrimination and thus violation of Article 14 of the Constitution of India on the ground that several employees of the various Colleges have been granted STUM/2nd ACP after 12 years from the date of OTUM, where they received OTUM before 08.04.1998. Petitioner has furnished a list of such employees and has also referred to notings wherein this position is accepted. Learned counsel also relies on letters of the UGC dated 25.06.2002 and 14.07.2010 as also letters of the University dated 24.08.2001, 03.10.2001, 28.06.2002 and 09/11.12.2003 apart from the



2024:DHC:5533



proposal and Office Orders issued by the College recommending in favour of the Petitioner for grant of STUM on 02.01.1998 instead of 09.08.1999.

10. Delhi University has filed a short affidavit and relying on the same Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, learned counsel submits that initially, the University was supporting the case of the Petitioner and was abiding by the directions of the UGC contained in letter dated 13/14.07.2010 and 25.06.2002, however, subsequently, it was decided to give effect to STUM from the date of DoPT O.M. dated 09.08.1999, introducing the ACP Scheme.

11. UGC in its affidavit has stated that it had constituted a Joint Cadre Review Committee ('JCRC') in 2003 to bring uniformity in staffing pattern of non-teaching staff of Central Universities, UGC maintained deemed to be Universities and Delhi Colleges. Report of JCRC was examined by MHRD in consultation with Ministry of Finance and DoPT and guidelines were laid down stipulating that cut-off date of 08.04.1998 for termination of implementation of OTUM in respect of non-teaching staff, Group B, C and D categories, would be uniformly applicable to all and after cut-off date of 08.04.1998, ACP Scheme would only be implemented from 09.08.1999. It is further stated that fixation of pay of an employee upon grant of OTUM/ACP/MACP is a matter *inter-se* between the College and the University, however, University is under an obligation to ensure that guidelines of MHRD and UGC are followed.

12. Detailed counter-affidavit has been filed by the College and relying on the same, Mr. Santosh Kumar, learned counsel at the outset argues that the petition is barred by delay and laches inasmuch as Petitioner retired on 31.01.2011 and the decision to grant STUM/2nd ACP from 09.08.1999 was



2024:DHC:5533



conveyed to the Petitioner on 20/24.12.2013, but Petitioner has chosen to file this petition in 2019, i.e., after 06 years.

13. On merits, it is argued by Mr. Santosh Kumar that College had recommended grant of STUM from 02.01.1998 to those who were granted OTUM before the cut-off date i.e. 08.04.1998, on completion of 12 years from OTUM, which the University approved vide letter dated 09.12.2003. UGC vide letter dated 17.07.2003 required the College to refer each case under ACP Scheme to the UGC for consideration and final approval. In view of this, College kept the two cases pending and vide letter dated 24.05.2006 requested the UGC for clarification as to the date of the implementation of financial upgradation under ACP, in response to which UGC vide letter dated 30.06.2006 informed the College that since there was no scheme between 02.01.1998 and 09.08.1999, 2nd financial upgradation can be granted only from 09.08.1999, when ACP Scheme became operational. In a nutshell, stand of the College is that it has been following the instructions of the University and the UGC and acting under them, despite its own recommendations in favour of the Petitioner, to the contrary.

14. Heard learned counsels for the parties and examined their respective submissions.

15. The only issue that arises for consideration before this Court is whether the Petitioner is entitled to grant of STUM w.e.f. 02.01.1998 instead of 09.08.1999 in terms of EC Resolution No.101 dated 23.08.2001.

16. It is an undisputed position that Petitioner was granted OTUM w.e.f. 02.01.1986 in the pay scale of Rs.1350-2200 which was revised from the said date to Rs.1400-2300 in terms of EC decision dated 09.03.1991 as approved by the University vide letter dated 28.05.1997. On implementation



2024:DHC:5533



of 5th CPC, Petitioner was placed in the pay scale of Rs.4500-7000 w.e.f. 01.01.1996. Petitioner claims that since OTUM was granted from 02.01.1986, she was entitled to STUM on completion of 12 years from the said date, i.e., w.e.f. 02.01.1998 in the pay scale of Rs.5500-9000. Petitioner essentially rests her case on the EC Resolution dated 23.08.2001 and substantiates it further by relying on letters of the UGC and the University, which at the initial stages favoured the Petitioner and were in sync with the favourable proposals/recommendations of the College. It is, therefore, significant to refer to the EC Resolution dated 23.08.2001, which is extracted hereunder for ready reference:

“The Executive Council approved the following ACP Scheme and resolved that:

- 1. One Time Upward Movement (OTUM) to be given to those Group B, C, D employees who are eligible under the scheme for one time upward movement till the cut off date of 07.04.1998.*
- 2. After 08.04.98, Delhi University shall abide by the terms of promotion as indicated in the ACP Scheme of Government of India, (i.e. 12 + 12 years) and movement in the immediate higher scale) in toto. For those who received OTUM before 08.04.98, the second upgradation will be 12 years from the date of the first upward movement. The grant of such Upward Movement shall be on the basis of Confidential Reports / Performance Appraisals / Work and Conduct Reports.*
- 3. From 08.04.98 all personal promotion schemes, accelerated promotion schemes, career advancement schemes and financial upgradation schemes shall finally cease to exist.*
- 4. After 08.04.98 every recruitment in the University shall be done in the core pay scale indicated for the particular category by the Government / UGC to which an appointment is made. However, as a one-time exception, employees recruited and promoted before 08.04.98 would remain in the pay scale in which they*
- 5. At the time of any future pay revision the replacement scale for a category shall be the same prescribed by MHRD / UGC irrespective of the existing scale of the incumbent of a particular post / cadre category.*



6. Any promotion / upgradation given to an employee of the University shall be treated as upgradation for the purposes of the ACP Scheme. The benefits of an upward movements, any personal pay scales, any in situ promotions, any financial upgradations, and stepping up exercises, etc. already availed of shall be adjusted against ACP.

7. Those employees who have already been given Second Upward Movement (SUM) under personal promotion scheme etc. before 08.04.98 shall not be eligible for any pay upgradation under the ACP.

8. For employees recruited before 08.04.98, OUM and SUM of ACP should be calculated with reference to the pay scales as already approved by the Executive Council. For employees recruited after 08.04.98, OUM and SUM should be calculated with reference to the ___ scale of the post of as approved by MHRD/UGC vide annexure attached to the letter dated 08.04.98.

9. Anomalies, if any, arising in respect of pay fixation on adoption of the ACP Scheme be referred to an Anomalies Committee to be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor."

17. From a perusal of the Resolution, it is as clear as day that while approving the ACP Scheme, the EC resolved that: (a) OTUM will be given to those Group B, C, D employees who were eligible under the Scheme till the cut-off date of 07.04.1998; (b) after 08.04.1998, University shall abide by terms of promotion indicated in the ACP Scheme of Government of India, i.e., 12+12 years and movement in the immediate higher scale; (c) for those who received OTUM before 08.04.1998, 2nd upgradation will be 12 years from the date of first upward movement, on the basis of CRs/Performance Appraisals/Conduct Reports; and (d) from 08.04.1998, all personal promotion schemes, accelerated promotion schemes, career advancement schemes and financial upgradation schemes shall finally cease to exist. This clearly implied that a cut-off date of 07.04.1998 had been fixed by the EC, post which the Government's schemes for promotions, financial upgradations etc. were to operate. However, while so deciding, the EC,



consciously decided that those who had received OTUM prior to 08.04.1998 will continue to be eligible for 2nd upgradation on completion of 12 years from the grant of OTUM. No EC Resolution has been placed on record by the Respondents to show a reversal of this decision.

18. It is pertinent to note that the UGC also understood that in respect of the employees of the University, who had received OTUM before 08.04.1998, 2nd upgradation will be given after 12 years from the date of first upward movement and this is evident from UGC's letters dated 25.06.2002 and 13/14.07.2010, both of which are extracted hereunder:

Letter dated 25.06.2002

"Please refer to my earlier D.O. No. F.31-8/97(CU) dated 13th May, 2000 regarding implementation of Assured Career Progression Scheme (ACP) for Group B, C and D employees of the University as approved by Executive Council of the University of Delhi.

The UGC in consultation with Ministry of Human Resource Development has agreed to implement the ACP Scheme for group B, C and D employees as per the decision of the Executive Council of the University of Delhi taken in its emergent meeting held on 23.08.2001. It is clarified that in respect of such employees of the University who received One Time Upward Movement before B-4, 1998, the second upgradation will be given after 12 years from the date of the first upward movement."

Letter dated 13/14.07.2010

"Sub: Implementation of ACP Scheme of 9.8.1999 for the non-teaching employees of Central Universities, UGC maintained Deemed to be Universities and Delhi Colleges - regarding.

Sir,

This is in continuation to this office letter of even number dated 22nd March, 2010 on the subject mentioned above informing Central Universities, UGC maintained Deemed to be Universities and Delhi Colleges that the detailed guidelines on ACP Scheme are being developed on the basis of the recommendations of the UGC Standing Committee in the past while considering the individual cases from these institutions and enabling Universities to implement the ACP Scheme in respect of the remaining cases on similar lines on their own.



2, A copy of the guidelines as prepared by the Standing Committee on ACP Scheme and approved by UGC is enclosed herewith for guidance and strict compliance to deal with the remaining individual cases for award of financial upgradations under the ACP Scheme of 9.8.1999. As intimated earlier, the Universities/colleges need not send any ACP proposal to UGC and will implement on their own the DOPT ACP Scheme 9.8.99 in respect of remaining eligible cases during the period from 9.8.1999 to 31.8.2008 as per the guidelines enclosed.

3. It is to mention that these guidelines have been framed as per DOPT ACP scheme of 9.8.99. However, UGC approval in case of University of Delhi as conveyed vide its letter D.O. No.F.31-8/97(CU) dated 25th June, 2002 regarding the implementation of ACP Scheme for Group B, C and D employees as per decision of the Executive Council of the University in its meeting held on 23.8.2001 will remain applicable.

For any clarification / doubt, if so observed, the matter may be referred to the UGC for clarification / rectification. In case any discrepancy is observed in award of irregular financial upgradation under the Scheme, such recommendations are liable to be withdrawn. A copy of this letter alongwith the enclosures may be provided to the Finance Officer of the University.”

19. Significantly, the understanding of the University was no different. Vide its letter dated 24.08.2001, University wrote to the General Secretary, Delhi University and College Karamcharis Union informing them the decision of the EC dated 23.08.2001, particularly referring to grant of 2nd upgradation on completion of 12 years from the date of first upward movement. The letter is as follows:-

“Dear Sir,

I am glad to inform that the Executive Council at its emergent meeting held on 23-08-2001 took up the issues regarding the ACP Scheme. As you know, this has been the long standing demand of the Karamcharis, which the University has been making sustained efforts to resolve with the funding agencies. I am happy to inform that the Executive Council approved that:

1) the OTUM, be given to those Group B, C & D employees who are eligible under the scheme for OTUM till the cut off dated of 7-4-1998. As you know, earlier the Scheme was only upto 21-12-1996 and therefore this is indeed a matter of satisfaction that it is now extended up to 7-4-1998.



2) For those who got OTUM before 8-4-1998 the second upgradation will be 12 years from the date of the first upward movement. This in accordance with the EC Resolution of 8-2-2001 to grant two upward movement in a total career span of 20 years.

3) Anomalies, if any, arising in respect of pay fixation on adoption of the ACP Scheme be referred to an Anomalies Committee to be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor.

I would like to point out that this could be possible only due to the sustained efforts on the part of the University administration to find a sustainable solution to these long standing problems.

In the light of these possible developments, the EC appeals to the DUCKU that in the interest of the smooth functioning of the University and the interests of the students and teaching community to call off their strike and return to work immediately.”

20. In its letter dated 03.10.2001, the University reiterated the contents of EC Resolution dated 23.08.2001. In continuation thereof, vide letter dated 28.06.2002, the Registrar of the University wrote to all the Colleges in reference to the EC Resolution and stated that the Resolution had not been implemented so far in view of UGC letter dated 01/05.11.2001, but the issue had been reconsidered by the UGC, who finally agreed to implement ACP Scheme as per the Resolution dated 23.08.2001 and clarified vide its letter 25.06.2002 that those employees, who had received OTUM before 08.04.1998, will get 2nd upgradation after 12 years from first upward movement. Interestingly, University accorded its approval to fixation of pay of the Petitioner in the scale of Rs.5500-9000 from 02.01.1998, i.e., as 2nd upgradation vide Order dated 09.12.2003. General Circular dated 28.06.2002 and Order dated 09.12.2003 are extracted hereunder:

General Circular dated 28.06.2002

“Subject: - Implementation of Assured Career Progression Scheme for Group B, C and D Group Employees of the University and its Colleges as approved by the Executive Council.



2024:DHC:5533



Sir/Madam,

1. Please refer to Assistant Registrar (Colleges)'s Circular letter No. CB-III/2001 dated 18 October 2001 forwarding Registrar letter No. Estab. II (i)/2001 dated 3 October 2001 regarding Assured Career Progression Scheme as approved by the Executive Council at its meeting held on 23 August 2001. This scheme had not been implemented so far in view of University Grant Commission's letter No.F.1-47/99(DC) dated 1/5 November 2001 addressed to Principals of Colleges. The issue has since been reconsidered by the University Grants Commission who have now finally agreed to the implementation of the ACP in Delhi University and its Colleges. In this connection, the relevant extract from University Grants Commission's letter No.F.31-8/97 (CU) dated 25 June 2002 is reproduced below:-

"The UGC in consultation with Ministry of Human Resource Development has agreed to implement the ACP Scheme for Group B, C and D employees as per the decision of the Executive Council of the University of Delhi taken in its emergent meeting held on 23-08-2001. It is clarified that in respect of such employees of the University who received One Time Upward Movement before 08-04-1998 the Second Upgradation will be given after 12 years from the date of the first Upward Movement"

2 In view of the above you are requested to kindly take necessary action to implement Assured Career Progression Scheme in your College in consonance with the approvals given by the Executive Council as well as the University Grants Commission. The pre requisite steps for implementation of the Assured Career Progression Scheme have already been indicated in Registrar's letter No.Estab.II (i)/2001 dated 3 October 2001.

3. Receipt of this letter may please be acknowledged."

Order dated 09.12.2003

"Sub.:- Placement in the next higher scale under Second Time Upward Movement in terms of ACP Scheme"

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Please refer to your letter no. VC/2003/1395 dated 07.07.03 on the subjected cited above.

On the basis of the information supplied by the college, the University accords its approval to the fixation of pay in respect of Mrs. Bimla Virmani on her completion of 12 years regular service in the cadre of Semi Port, Asstt. has been placed in the next higher scale of Rs.5500-175-9000 on personal basis at Rs.6025/ p.m. w.e.f. 02.01.1998 plus usual allowances under the Govt. of India/University Grants Commission Assured Career Progression Scheme (ACP) as approved by the Executive Council of the



2024:DHC:5533



University at its meeting held on 23.08.2001. She will draw her next increment on 02.01.1999 and subsequent increments on 1st January each year, if otherwise admissible.

The above placement is subject to further conditions as under:-

i) The placement under ACP Scheme does not amount to regular promotion. It will be personal to the incumbent and she will continue to hold her present designation.

ii) As the above financial upgradation is personal to the incumbent it has no relevance to her seniority position; therefore, there shall be no additional financial upgradation for the senior employee merely because the junior in the grade has got higher pay scale under the ACT Scheme.

iii) The pay shall be fixed under the ACP Scheme of Govt. of India/ University Grants Commission as per FR 22(I)(a)(i) subject to a minimum financial benefit of Rs.100/-. This benefit shall be final and no pay fixation benefit shall accrue at the time of regular promotion,

iv) The incumbent granted benefit under the above scheme is deemed to have given her unqualified acceptance for regular promotion on occurrence of vacancy subsequently.

The service book of Mrs. Bimla Virmani is returned herewith.

The above approval is subject to the satisfactory report for the last three years."

21. Insofar as the College is concerned, it has always recommended in favour of the Petitioner, but as stated in the affidavit, it declined the request of the Petitioner, once the UGC and the University changed their stance. In view of the EC Resolution, whereby it was clearly decided to grant STUM on completion of 12 years to employees who had received OTUM prior to 07.04.1998, this Court is unable to accept the contra stand of the Respondents. Admittedly, Petitioner falls in the category of employees who received first upgradation before the cut-off date and is eligible for grant of STUM on 02.01.1998, when he completed 12 years from 02.01.1986.

22. Reading of the counter-affidavits of the respective Respondents does not show any significant defence, save and except, stating that the ACP



2024:DHC:5533



Scheme was introduced from 09.08.1999 and 2nd upgradation should thus be granted from the said date as also passing the blame on one another. This argument in defence is wholly misconceived and overlooks the crucial fact that the EC had consciously resolved while taking a decision to implement the ACP Scheme that Delhi University shall abide by the ACP Scheme after 08.04.1998 and in the same Resolution, it was carved out that those who had received OTUM before 08.04.1998 would be entitled for 2nd upgradation on completion of 12 years from the date of 1st upgradation. It was also resolved that only from 08.04.1998 all personal promotion/accelerated promotion/ career advancement/financial upgradation schemes shall cease to exist. This clearly shows that the intent was not to link those employees who had received first upgradation before the cut-off date to the implementation of ACP Scheme and basis this, even the University and the UGC initially agreed and approved to grant the benefit to the Petitioner and similarly placed employees. It is thus not open to the Respondents to give effect to the grant of STUM to the Petitioner from 09.08.1999, linking it with the operationalisation of the ACP Scheme.

23. In this context, it is also important to highlight that several employees of different Colleges, similarly placed as the Petitioner, have been granted 2nd financial upgradations on completion of 12 years from grant of first upgradation which they received prior to 07.04.1998. Petitioner has given a list of such employees in the writ petition and the position is uncontroverted. Additionally, Petitioner has appended to the writ petition copies of note sheets substantiating this stand. In the noting dated 18.10.2013, it is admitted that one C.S. Pant was granted 2nd financial upgradation w.e.f. 06.06.1998, i.e., 12 years after 1st upgradation on 06.06.1986. In fact, the noting dated



2024:DHC:5533



02.05.2012 refers to number of such employees who were granted benefit of the EC Resolution dated 23.08.2001, but what is worth noting is that it is clearly recorded in the noting that the Resolution was never withdrawn and therefore, it must be implemented in letter and spirit and after 08.04.1998 University may stick to the ACP Scheme, subject to the conditions mentioned therein.

24. Accordingly, this Court is of the view that Petitioner is entitled to STUM from 02.01.1998 instead of 09.08.1999 and the writ petition is allowed directing the Respondents to give effect to the EC Resolution No.101 dated 23.08.2001 in letter and spirit and grant STUM to the Petitioner from 02.01.1998, subject to any other condition that may be required to be fulfilled under the norms of STUM. Consequentially, the pay of the Petitioner shall be re-fixed and the arrears will be released. All other consequential benefits upon re-fixation of pay shall also be granted to the Petitioner. The entire exercise shall be completed within eight weeks from today.

25. Writ petition stands disposed of.

JYOTI SINGH, J

JULY 18, 2024/kks/jg