
(2018) 05 DEL CK 0109
In the Delhi High Court
Case No : W.P.(C) 10491 OF 2016

AJAY KUMAR

APPELLANT

Vs

CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA & ANR.

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-05-2018

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2018) 05 DEL CK 0109

Hon'ble Judges : SUNIL GAUR

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Simraj Jyot Singh, Shiva Lakshmi, Siddharth Singh, Ruchir Ranjan Rai, . J.K. Mittal, . J.K. Mittal

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

1. Petitioner was re-employed with respondent-Bank as Armed Guard on 1st July, 2011 after he had retired from Armed Services in September,

2002. In this petition, quashing of letter of 15th September, 2015 (Annexure P-1) is sought while relying upon DoPT's O.M. of 5th April, 2010

and another O.M. of 8th November, 2010.

2. Impugned order (Annexure P-1) clarifies that Indian Bank Association's Circular is applicable to persons re-employed in government service

after retirement from Armed Forces. In the counter affidavit filed by respondent-Bank, the stand taken is that the aforesaid OMs of the year 2010

are not applicable and the re-fixation of pay of Exservicemen re-employed in the respondent-Bank after 1st January, 2006 and in respect of those

Ex-servicemen retired before 1st January, 2006 has been done as per the Guidelines issued by Indian Banks' Association for pay fixation of Ex-

servicemen re-employed in Indian Banks' Association and the said guidelines

has been annexed as (Annexure R-1).

3. It is disclosed in the counter filed by the respondent-Bank that petitioner's salary has been fixed at basic pay of ` 5,850/- per month.

4. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that the aforesaid fixation of petitioner's salary is in contravention of Clause 2.1 (ii) which requires grant of stagnation increment, Rank Pay plus Dearness Pay and Dearness Allowance which according to learned counsel for petitioner ought to be 117% and not 52.80% as the dearness allowance cannot be stagnant.

5. On the contrary, learned counsel for respondent-Bank maintains that the re-fixation of pay of petitioner on re-employment is as per the Guidelines (Annexure R-1).

6. Upon hearing and on perusal of impugned order, the material on record, I find that the fixation of petitioner salary as per paragraph no: 9 of the counter affidavit, needs to be re-considered in light of the Guidelines (Annexure R-1) as those Guidelines takes note of OMs of 5th April, 2010 and 8th November, 2010.

7. Whether the case of petitioner falls in Clause 2.1 (ii) or Clause 2.3 of the aforesaid Guidelines (Annexure R-1) needs to be clarified by the respondent-Bank. Let the reconsideration of re-fixation of petitioner's salary be done within a period of twelve weeks and its fate be intimated to petitioner so that petitioner may avail of the remedy as available in law, if need be.

8. With the aforesaid directions, this petition is disposed of.