

(2012) 02 AHC CK 0271
In the Allahabad High Court
Case No : Service Single No. - 664 of 2012

Sharad Chandra and Others

APPELLANT

Vs

State of U.P. and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 03-02-2012

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2012) 02 AHC CK 0271

Hon'ble Judges : Devendra Kumar Arora, J

Bench : Single Bench

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Hon"ble Devendra Kumar Arora, J.—Heard learned counsel for parties and perused the record. By means of this writ petition, the petitioners have prayed for a writ in the nature of mandamus commanding the opposite parties to pay them regular pay-scale w.e.f. 31.3.1989 on which date the said benefits have been given to the petitioners of W.P. No. 3558 (SS) of 1992, Suresh Chandra Tiwari & others and petitioners of W.P. No. 42196 of 1992 from the date of their initial appointments as Tubewell Operators, with all consequential benefits of service together with arrears of pay.

2. Submission of learned counsel for petitioners is that the petitioners were initially appointed on the post of Part-time Tubewell Operators in their respective divisions of the Irrigation Department between 07.6.1983 to 05.8.1986. Subsequently, vide notification dated 20.2.1992 their nomenclature was changed as Tubewell Assistant and an honorarium of 550/per month was fixed. The said notification was challenged by filing bunch of writ petitions leading with W. P. No. 3558 (SS) of 1992, Suresh Chandra Tewari & others vs. State of U. P. & others which were allowed vide judgment & order dated 18.5.1994 (Annexure No. 2) and the Notification dated 20.2.1992 was quashed. The opposite parties were directed to pay all the petitioners the same emoluments i.e. in the same scale of pay in which other regularly appointed tubewell operators were being paid. It is also pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioners that the said judgment &

order dated 18.5.1994 was challenged by the respondents before the Hon''ble Supreme Court by way of filing SLP But the same was dismissed vide judgment & order dated 22.3.1995. Thereafter review of the judgment & order dated 22.3.1995 was also filed before the apex court but that too was rejected on 18.10.1995.

3. It is further submitted that even after dismissal of review petition by the Hon''ble Supreme Court the respondents did not make compliance of the order and, therefore, contempt petitions no. 2134 (c) of 1995 (Avadhesh Kumar Singh & others vs. Smt. Sunita Kandpal & others), 2136 (C) of 1995 (Surendra Pal Singh and others vs. Smt. Sunita Kandpal & others) and 3465 (C) of 1995 (Brijendra Pal Singh Vs. Smt. Sunita Kandpal & others) were filed. In consequence of filing of contempt petitions, the respondents thereafter passed order dated 27.10.1995 providing the same emoluments to the said petitioners as were being paid to other regular tubewell operators.

4. Learned counsel for petitioners further pointed out that another W.P. No. 7489 (SS) of 2000 (Avdhesh Kumar Singh vs. State of U. P. & others) was also filed for grant of regular pay-scale w.e.f. 31.3.1989 which was disposed of finally in terms of the judgment & order dated 18.5.1994 vide judgment & order dated 21.12.2000. Against the said judgment & order dated 21.12.2000 the respondents filed Special Appeal which was dismissed. The respondents also filed Review Petition No. 120 of 2010 which too was dismissed vide judgment & order dated 20.7.2010. Thus, the judgment & order dated 21.12.2000 passed in writ petition has become final. Submission of learned counsel for petitioners is that controversy has already been settled by this Court in W. P. No. 3558 of 1992, Suresh Chandra Tewari & others vs, State of U. P. & others.

5. Learned Standing Counsel admits that the present writ petition is covered by the decision of Suresh Chandra Tiwari (supra). In view of the above, this writ petition is disposed of finally in terms of the judgment & order passed in W.P. No. 3558 (SS) of 1992, Suresh Chandra Tiwari & others vs. State of U. P. & others with the further directions to the opposite parties to grant benefit of the said judgment to the present petitioners.