



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 2812 OF 2023

State of Maharashtra thr. its Principal Secretary and others.

Vs

Vinay Vasant Nagdeo

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

Mr. N.S.Rao, AGP for petitioners/State.

Mr. R.V. Shiralkar, counsel for respondent (caveator)

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR and RAJNISH R. VYAS, JJ.
DATE : 19/12/2025

1. Heard.

2. The challenge in this writ petition is to the order passed by the learned Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal, Nagpur, in Original Application No. 258/2021 dated 05/07/2022, whereby the original respondents were directed to pay interest on the delayed payment of Leave Encashment, G.P.F., Gratuity, GIS, Pension Commutation, Regular Pension Arrears, and Provisional Pension, at the rate applicable to G.P.F., after calculating the period of delay, within one month from the date of receipt of this order.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners/original respondents submits that the Tribunal ought to have considered the fact that there was absolutely no delay on their part in making the payment. He further states that the findings given by the learned tribunal are not in accordance with the documents produced before it. We have gone through the order, more particularly, findings at para-11.

4. The learned Tribunal has categorically observed that delay was due to administrative difficulty and has rightly granted interest on the aforesaid amount.

5. Mr. Shiralkar, learned counsel for the respondents, has brought to our notice the Government Resolution dated 15/11/2022, which is taken on record and marked as document -X for identification. A perusal of said resolution dated 15/11/2022 reveals that similarly situated persons have been extended the benefits and the amounts have also been disbursed in their favour.

6. Mr. Shiralkar, learned counsel, further submitted during the course of arguments that similarly situated persons have been extended benefits, in view of orders passed by the Principal Seat at Bombay in various Original Applications. He submits that the petitioner is also entitled to similar treatment and, therefore, the Tribunal has rightly allowed the petition. Considering the fact that the Tribunal has dealt with the matter, more particularly at paragraph 14, and since similarly situated persons have been extended the benefits of interest due to delays caused by the respondents, we do not find any jurisdictional error or perversity committed by the Tribunal.

7. Considering that the issue relates to delayed payment caused by the respondents, we direct that the disbursement be made within eight weeks from the production of this order before the concerned authorities.

8. In view of the above, the writ petition is **disposed of** accordingly.

(RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)