

**BEFORE THE UTTARAKHAND PUBLIC SERVICES TRIBUNAL
BENCH AT NAINITAL**

Present: Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C.Dhyani

----- Chairman

Hon'ble Capt. Alok Shekhar Tiwari

-----Member (A)

CLAIM PETITION NO 90/NB/SB/ 2021

Dalip Singh aged about 61 years, s/o Late Sri Gopal Singh, r/o Village Kutri
Post Office- Chakarpur, District Udham Singh Nagar.

.....Petitioner

VS

1. State of Uttarakhand through Secretary, Transport, Govt. of Uttarakhand, District Dehradun.
2. Transport Commissioner, Uttarakhand, Dehradun
3. Managing Director (Technical), Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, H.Q., Dehradun.
4. Divisional Manager (Operation), Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Tanakpur, District Champawat.
5. Divisional Manager (Technical), Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Tanakpur, District Champawat.
6. Assistant General Manager (Finance) Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Tanakpur, District Champawat.

.....Respondents

WITH

CLAIM PETITION NO 85/NB/DB/ 2022

Hemendra Singh Rawat, aged about 65 years, s/o Late Sri Heera Singh Rawat,
r/o Pragati Vihar, Daharia, Rampur Road, Haldwani, District Nainital.

WITH

CLAIM PETITION NO 86/NB/DB/ 2022

Surendra Singh, aged about 61 years, s/o Late Sri Bishan Singh Rawat, r/o Golcha Compound, Tanakpur Road, Haldwani, District Nainital.

WITH

CLAIM PETITION NO 87/NB/DB/ 2022

Lalit Lal Sah, aged about 63 years, s/o Late Sri Ishwar Lal Sah, r/o L.I.G. 120, Awas Vikas, Haldwani, District Nainital.

WITH

CLAIM PETITION NO 88/NB/DB/ 2022

Ramesh Chandra Singh (dead through L.R.) Smt. Gauri Devi, aged about 60 years, w/o Late Sri Ramesh Chandra Singh, r/o Village Haripur Ratan Singh, P.O. Devalchaur, Haldwani, District Nainital.

WITH

CLAIM PETITION NO 89/NB/DB/ 2022

Lalit Mohan Chaudhary, aged about 64 years, s/o Late Sri Kripal Dutt Chaudhary, r/o Shanti Nagar, House No. 1/143, Bhotia Paraw, Chaudhary Mansion, Haldwani, District Nainital.

WITH

CLAIM PETITION NO 90/NB/DB/ 2022

Anoop Singh Bisht, aged about 62 years, s/o Late Sri Daulat Singh Bisht, r/o Om Vihar, Bithoriya No.1, Gair Baisali, Haldwani, District Nainital.

WITH

CLAIM PETITION NO 91/NB/DB/ 2022

Kumar Dutt Bhatt, aged about 62 years, s/o Late Sri M.D. Bhatt, r/o Jagnath Colony, Near Hydrel Gate, Damuadhoonga, Kathgodam, District Nainital.

.....Petitioners

VS.

1. State of Uttarakhand through Secretary, Transport, Civil Secretariat, Subhash Road, Dehradun.
2. Managing Director, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, U.C.F. Sadan Deep Nagar Road, Vishnu Vihar, Ajabpur Kalan, Dehradun.
3. General Manager (Technical) Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, U.C.F. Sadan Deep Nagar Road, Vishnu Vihar, Ajabpur Kalan, Dehradun.
4. Divisional Manager (Technical), Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Kathgodam, District Nainital.
5. Assistant General Manager, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Haldwani, District Nainital. (*only in claim petition No. 86/NB/DB/2022*)

.....Respondents

In Claim Petition No. 90/NB/SB/2021

(virtually)

Present: Sri K.K.Tiwari, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Sri Kishore Kumar, A.P.O., for Respondents No. 1 & 2.
Sri Lalit Samant, Advocate, for Respondents No. 3 to 6.

In Claim Petitions No. 85/NB/DB/22, 86/NB/DB/22, 87/NB/DB/22, 88/NB/DB/22, 89/NB/DB/22, 90/NB/DB/22 & 91/NB/DB/22

(virtually)

Present: Sri Vinod Tiwari & Sri Ganesh Kandpal, Advocates, for the petitioner.
Sri Kishore Kumar, A.P.O., for Respondent No. 1.
Sri Ashish Joshi, Advocate, for UKTC (Respondents No. 2 to 5).

JUDGMENT

DATED: SEPTEMBER 03, 2024.

Justice U.C.Dhyani (Oral)

The factual matrix of the above noted claim petitions is almost the same. Law governing the field is the same. Therefore, these claim

petitions are being disposed of, by a common judgment and order, for the sake of brevity and convenience, with the consent of Ld. Counsel for the parties.

2. Relevant facts, which are necessary for adjudication of present claim petitions, are summarized in the following paragraphs:

3. **Claim Petition No. 90/NB/SB/2021, Dalip Singh:**

Petitioner was initially appointed as Cleaner in the respondent department. He retired as Junior foreman on 31.01.2020 after attaining the age of superannuation. *Vide* order dated 27.04.2019, issued by Respondent No. 5, his enhanced grade pay of Rs. 4200/- was reduced to Rs.2800/- . Petitioner submitted his representation against the same, but to no avail. *Vide* order dated 10.01.2020, the salary of the petitioner was recalculated and his grade pay was reduced from Rs. 4200/- to Rs. 2800/-. *Vide* order dated 13.08.2020, issued by Respondent No.6, it was ordered that a sum of Rs. 1,36,267/- shall be deducted from the dues of the petitioner. Thereafter, deduction was also made (on the pretext of 'excess payment' having been made) from the gratuity of the petitioner. Although leave-encashment of the petitioner was sanctioned, but it was ordered that the amount of leave encashment shall be paid only after deducting the excess payment made to the petitioner. After almost 8 months, neither the gratuity was paid nor the leave encashment was released. This claim petition has been filed for setting aside the impugned orders of recovery and releasing the gratuity amount along with interest. A prayer has also been made for releasing leave encashment along with interest.

3.1 Claim petition is supported by the affidavit of the petitioner. Relevant documents have been filed along with the petition.

3.2 Claim petition has been contested on behalf of respondents. Sri Lekh Raj Singh Pangti, Divisional Manager (Technical), Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Tanakpur Depot, Champawat has filed Counter Affidavit on behalf of Respondents No. 3, 4, 5 & 6.

3.3 In the C.A. an effort has been made to justify the departmental action by pleading that the same was determined after conducting audit by respondent corporation. It is also pleaded that the leave encashment of the petitioner was deducted after adjusting the excess amount paid to the petitioner.

4. Claim Petition No. 85/NB/DB/2022, Hemendra Singh Rawat:

Petitioner was initially appointed on the post of Cleaner in the respondent department and retired on 31.07.2017 as Walknizer (Assistant Mechanic/ Electrician), after attaining the age of superannuation. Petitioner was given financial up-gradation. On 26.11.2021, petitioner was sent an official order to say that the tentative salary assessment has been amended. Petitioner filed objections against the same. His representation was rejected. After retirement, petitioner's gratuity was also sanctioned, but was reduced after making amendments. This was done after his retirement. The anomaly, if any, in the pay scale, was due to the mistake committed by the respondent department. Petitioner seeks to set aside the impugned orders and direct the respondents to release complete amount of gratuity, leave encashment and other arrears, which have been recovered from the petitioner on the basis of reduced grade pay .

4.1 Claim petition is supported by the affidavit of the petitioner. Relevant documents have been filed along with the petition.

4.2 Claim petition has been contested on behalf of respondents. Sri Manoj Durgapal, Assistant General Manager, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Kathgodam, has filed Counter Affidavit on behalf of Respondents No. 2, 3 & 4. Relevant documents have also been filed in support of the Counter Affidavit.

4.3 In the C.A., an endeavour has been made to justify the departmental action. It has mentioned in the C.A. thus filed that the pay fixation of the petitioner is as per rules, therefore, the adjustment of the excess payment was rightly done by the Respondent Corporation. In para 24

of the C.A., it has been mentioned that the Special Appeal No. 241/2022, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation vs. Balam Singh Aswal is pending adjudication before the Hon'ble High Court. The claim petition should be dismissed.

4.4 Rejoinder Affidavit has been filed by the petitioner.

5. Claim Petition No. 86/NB/DB/2022, Surendra Singh Rawat:

Petitioner was initially appointed as Cleaner in the respondent department and retired on 31.01.2021 as Mechanic (Body), after attaining the age of superannuation. The dispute arose on account of introduction of Assured Career Progression Scheme (ACP). Petitioner was given benefit of financial up-gradation. Subsequently, it was found by the respondent department that the petitioner was given excess payment. His grade pay was reduced. After retirement, although gratuity was sanctioned to the petitioner, but substantial deduction was made in the same on the pretext of 'excess payment' made to him. Petitioner seeks to set aside the impugned orders and direct the respondents to release complete gratuity, leave encashment and other arrears, which have been recovered from the petitioner on the basis of reduced grade pay.

5.1 Claim petition is supported by the affidavit of the petitioner. Relevant documents have been filed in support of the petition.

5.2 Claim petition has been contested on behalf of respondents. Sri Manoj Durgapal, Assistant General Manager, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Kathgodam, has filed Counter Affidavit on behalf of Respondents No. 2, 3, 4 & 5. Relevant documents have also been filed in support of the Counter Affidavit.

5.3 In the C.A., an endeavour has been made to justify the departmental action. It has been mentioned in the C.A. that the grade pay of the petitioner was determined after conducting audit by respondent corporation. It has also been mentioned in the C.A. that the Special Appeal No. 241/2022, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation vs. Balam Singh Aswal is

pending adjudication before the Hon'ble High Court. The claim petition should, therefore, be dismissed.

5.4 Rejoinder Affidavit has been filed by the petitioner.

6. **Claim Petition No. 87/NB/DB/2022, Lalit Lal Sah:**

Petitioner was initially appointed on the post of Cleaner in the respondent department and retired on 30.11.2019 as Assistant Mechanic/Electrician (Walknizer) after attaining the age of superannuation. The dispute arose on account of introduction of Assured Career Progression Scheme (ACP). Petitioner was given benefit of financial up-gradation. Subsequently, it was found by the respondent department that the petitioner was given excess payment. His grade pay was reduced. After retirement, although gratuity was sanctioned to the petitioner, but substantial deduction was made in the same on the pretext of 'excess payment' made to him. Petitioner is entitled for his gratuity and other arrears under grade pay Rs.4200/-, which was last drawn by him at the time of retirement. The petitioner, therefore, seeks to set aside the impugned orders and direct the respondents to release gratuity after calculating the same according to grade pay Rs.4200/- and pay the amount of leave encashment which was recovered on the basis of wrong calculation of grade pay after amendment.

6.1 Claim petition is supported by the affidavit of the petitioner. Relevant documents have been filed in support of the petition.

6.2 Claim petition has been contested on behalf of respondents. Sri Manoj Durgapal, Assistant General Manager, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Kathgodam, has filed Counter Affidavit on behalf of Respondents No. 2, 3, 4 & 5. Relevant documents have also been filed in support of the Counter Affidavit.

6.3 In the C.A., an effort has been made to defend the departmental action. It has been mentioned in the C.A. that the grade pay of the petitioner was determined after conducting audit by respondent

corporation. It has also been mentioned in the C.A. that the Special Appeal No. 241/2022, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation vs. Balam Singh Aswal is pending adjudication before the Hon'ble High Court. The claim petition should, therefore, be dismissed.

6.4 Rejoinder Affidavit has been filed by the petitioner.

7. Claim Petition No. 88/NB/DB/2022, Ramesh Chandra Singh:

Petitioner was initially appointed as Cleaner in the respondent department and retired on 31.07.2017 as Assistant Mechanic/ Electrician after attaining the age of superannuation. On account of introduction of Assured Career Progression Scheme (ACP), petitioner was given benefit of financial up-gradation. On 08.10.2021, petitioner was sent an official order to say that the tentative salary assessment has been amended. Petitioner filed objection/ representation against the same, which was not considered by the respondent department. After retirement, petitioner's gratuity was also sanctioned, but was reduced after making amendments. This was done after his retirement. The anomaly, if any, in the pay scale, was due to the mistake committed by the respondent department. Petitioner seeks to set aside the impugned orders and direct the respondents to release gratuity after calculating the same according to grade pay Rs.4200/- and pay the amount of leave encashment which was recovered on the basis of wrong calculation of grade pay after amendment.

7.1 Claim petition is supported by the affidavit of Sri Ramesh Chandra Singh, petitioner. Relevant documents have been filed in support of the petition.

7.2 During pendency of claim petition, petitioner died. His wife Smt. Gauri Devi was substituted in place of Sri Ramesh Chandra Singh (since deceased) to pursue the claim petition.

7.3 Claim petition has been contested on behalf of respondents. Sri Manoj Durgopal, Assistant General Manager, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Kathgodam, has filed Counter Affidavit on behalf of

Respondents No. 2, 3 & 4. Relevant documents have also been filed along with the Counter Affidavit.

7.4 In the C.A., an effort has been made to defend the departmental action by stating that the grade pay of the petitioner was determined after conducting audit by respondent corporation. The pay fixation of the petitioner is as per rules, therefore, the adjustment of the excess payment was rightly done by the respondent corporation. In the C.A., it has been mentioned that the Special Appeal No. 241/2022, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation vs. Balam Singh Aswal is pending adjudication before the Hon'ble High Court. The claim petition should, therefore, be dismissed.

7.5 Rejoinder Affidavit has been filed by the petitioner.

8. Claim Petition No. 89/NB/DB/2022, Lalit Mohan Chaudhary,

Petitioner was initially appointed as Cleaner in the respondent department and retired on 31.07.2018 from the post of Mechanic (Body) after attaining the age of superannuation. The dispute arose on account of introduction of Assured Career Progression Scheme (ACP). Petitioner was given benefit of financial up-gradation. Subsequently, it was found by the respondent department that the petitioner was given excess payment. His grade pay was reduced. After retirement, although gratuity was sanctioned to the petitioner, but respondents, on the pretext of 'excess payment' made to him, recovered the same from the leave encashment and other arrears of the petitioner. The anomaly, if any, in the pay scale, was due to the mistake committed by the respondent department. Petitioner seeks to set aside the impugned order and direct the respondents to release gratuity after calculating the same according to grade pay Rs.4200/- and pay the amount of leave encashment which was recovered on the basis of wrong calculation of grade pay after amendment.

8.1 Claim petition is supported by the affidavit the petitioner. Relevant documents have been filed in support of the petition.

8.2 Claim petition has been contested on behalf of respondents. Sri Manoj Durgapal, Assistant General Manager, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Kathgodam, has filed Counter Affidavit on behalf of Respondents No. 2, 3 & 4. Relevant documents have also been filed in support of the Counter Affidavit.

8.3 In the C.A., an endeavour has been made to defend the departmental action by stating that the grade pay of the petitioner was determined after conducting audit by the respondent corporation. Pay fixation of the petitioner is as per rules, therefore, the adjustment of the excess payment was rightly done by the respondent corporation. In para 24 of the C.A., it has been mentioned that the Special Appeal No. 241/2022, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation vs. Balam Singh Aswal is pending adjudication before the Hon'ble High Court. The claim petition should, therefore, be dismissed on merits.

8.4 Rejoinder Affidavit has been filed by the petitioner.

9. Claim Petition No. 90/NB/DB/2022, Anoop Singh Bisht:

Petitioner was initially appointed on the post of Cleaner in the respondent department and was re-mustered as Fitter (electrician). Petitioner retired on 31.03.2020, after attaining the age of superannuation. Petitioner was given benefit of financial up-gradation, but Subsequently his enhanced grade pay of Rs. 4200/- was reduced to Rs.2800/- . Petitioner is entitled to his gratuity and other arrears under grade pay Rs.4200/-, which was last drawn by him at the time of retirement. The petitioner, therefore, seeks to set aside the impugned orders and direct the respondents to release gratuity after calculating the same according to grade pay Rs.4200/- and to pay the amount of difference which is recovered by the respondents from the gratuity of the petitioner.

9.1 Claim petition is supported by the affidavit the petitioner. Relevant documents have been filed in support of the petition.

9.2 Claim petition has been contested on behalf of respondents. Sri Manoj Durgopal, Assistant General Manager, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Kathgodam, has filed Counter Affidavit on behalf of Respondents No. 2, 3 & 4. Relevant documents have also been filed in support of the Counter Affidavit.

9.3 In the C.A., an endeavour has been made to defend the departmental action by stating that the grade pay of the petitioner was determined after conducting audit by the respondent corporation. Pay fixation of the petitioner is as per rules, therefore, the adjustment of the excess payment was rightly done by the respondent corporation. In the C.A., it has been mentioned that the Special Appeal No. 241/2022, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation vs. Balam Singh Aswal is pending adjudication before the Hon'ble High Court. The claim petition should, therefore, be dismissed on merits.

9.4 Rejoinder Affidavit has been filed by the petitioner.

10. Claim Petition No. 91/NB/DB/2022, Kumar Dutt Bhatt:

Petitioner was initially appointed as Fitter from Cleaner through the Selection Committee. He retired on 29.02.2020 from a Group 'C' post after attaining the age of superannuation. Petitioner was given benefit of A.C.P. Later on, financial up-gradation was curtailed on the ground that he is not entitled to the same. The gratuity was sanctioned to him, but the excess amount was recovered from his retiral dues. The petitioner is entitled to restoration of the same. He seeks to set aside the impugned orders and calculate the gratuity according to grade pay Rs.4200/- and to pay the amount of difference which is recovered by the respondents from the gratuity of the petitioner as well as the remaining amount of leave encashment according to the grade pay Rs.2800/-

10.1 Claim petition is supported by the affidavit the petitioner. Relevant documents have been filed in support of the petition.

10.2 Claim petition has been contested on behalf of respondents. Sri Manoj Durgapal, Assistant General Manager, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Kathgodam, has filed Counter Affidavit on behalf of Respondents No. 2, 3 & 4. Relevant documents have also been filed in support of the Counter Affidavit.

10.3 In the C.A., an endeavour has been made to defend the departmental action by stating that the grade pay of the petitioner was determined after conducting audit by respondent corporation. The pay fixation of the petitioner is as per rules, therefore, the adjustment of the excess payment was rightly done by the respondent corporation. In the C.A., it has been mentioned that the Special Appeal No. 241/2022, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation vs. Balam Singh Aswal is pending adjudication before the Hon'ble High Court. The claim petition should, therefore, be dismissed on merits.

10.4 Rejoinder Affidavit has been filed by the petitioner.

DISCUSSION

11. A bunch of writ petitions was decided by the Hon'ble High Court *vide* judgment and order dated 14.06.2022. The same was assailed by the Uttarakhand Transport Corporation and others in Intra-Court Appeal. Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand decided Special Appeal No. 245/2022, Managing Director, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation and others vs. Ashok Kumar Saxena and connected special appeals *vide* order dated 04.04.2024. The situation, which is confronted by the Tribunal in present claim petitions, is covered by the judgment and order dated 14.06.2022, rendered by the Hon'ble High Court, which has been affirmed by the Hon'ble Division Bench in Special Appeal No. 245/2022 *vide* order dated 04.04.2024.

12. In such a situation, present claim petitions may safely be disposed of in terms of the aforesaid decisions of the Hon'ble High Court. Although Hon'ble High Court has settled the controversy finally, yet this

Tribunal feels it proper to give a brief background of such disputes which have been taken up to Hon'ble Apex Court, in the subsequent paragraphs.

13. The petitioners in the above noted cases were given monetary benefit, which was in excess of their entitlement. The monetary benefits flowed to them consequent upon mistakes committed by the Respondent Corporation in determining the emoluments payable to them. Long and short of the matter is that the petitioners were in receipt of monetary benefits, beyond the due amount, on account of unintentional mistake committed by the Respondent Corporation.

14. One essential factual component of the above noted cases is that the petitioners were not guilty of furnishing any incorrect information, which led the Respondent Corporation to commit the mistake of making higher payments to them. In other words, the payment of higher dues to the petitioners was not on account of any misrepresentation made by them, nor was it on account of any fraud committed by them. Any participation of the petitioners in the mistake committed by the employer, in extending the undeserved monetary benefit to them (employees), is totally ruled out. The petitioners were as innocent as their employer, in the wrongful determination of their inflated emoluments.

15. The issue was finally settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court in State of Punjab vs. Rafiq Masih, (2015) 4 SCC 334. Based on the decision rendered by Hon'ble Apex Court in Syed Abdul Qadir vs. State of Bihar, (2009) 3 SCC 475 and hosts of other decisions, which were cited therein including B.J. Akkara vs. Union of India, (2006) 11 SCC 709, the Hon'ble Apex Court concluded thus:

“18. It is not possible to postulate all situations of hardship, which would govern employees on the issue of recovery, where payments have mistakenly been made by the employer, in excess of their entitlement. Be that as it may, based on the decisions referred to herein above, we may, as a ready reference, summarise the following few situations, wherein recoveries by the employers, would be impermissible in law:

(i) Recovery from employees belonging to Class-III and Class-IV service (or Group 'C' and Group 'D' service).

(ii) Recovery from retired employees, or employees who are due to retire within one year, of the order of recovery.

(iii) Recovery from employees, when the excess payment has been made for a period in excess of five years, before the order of recovery is issued.

(iv) Recovery in cases where an employee has wrongfully been required to discharge duties of a higher post, and has been paid accordingly, even though he should have rightfully been required to work against an inferior post.

(v) In any other case, where the Court arrives at the conclusion, that recovery if made from the employee, would be iniquitous or harsh or arbitrary to such an extent, as would far outweigh the equitable balance of the employer's right to recover.”

[Emphasis supplied]

16. Petitioners are retired Group ‘C’ employees and recovery made from them would be iniquitous or harsh to such an extent that it would far outweigh the equitable balance of employees’ right to recover.

17. Reference may also be had to the decisions rendered by the Hon’ble Apex Court on 02.05.2022 in Civil Appeal No. 7115 of 2010, Thomas Daniel vs. State of Kerala & others, & in Civil Appeal No. 13407/ 2014 with Civil Appeal No. 13409 of 2015, B.Radhakrishnan vs. State of Tamil Nadu on 17.11.2015, decision rendered by Hon’ble Uttarakhand High Court on 12.04.2018 in WPSS No. 1346 of 2016, Smt. Sara Vincent vs. State of Uttarakhand and others, and decision rendered by Hon’ble Madras High Court on 019.06.2019 in WP(MD) No. 23541/ 2015 and M.P. (MD) No. 1 of 2015, M.Janki vs. The District Treasury Officer and another, in this regard.

18. There is, however, no embargo on the respondent department against correct fixation of pay after retirement, as per the decision rendered by Hon’ble High Court of Judicature at Allahabad on 17.12.2018 in Writ -A No. 26639/2018, Smt. Hasina Begum vs. Purvanchal Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd, Prayagraj and 02 others [Citation- 2018:AHC:204373].

19. Hon’ble Supreme Court, in the decision rendered in Civil Appeal No.1985 of 2022, the State of Maharashtra and another vs. Madhukar Antu Patil and another, on 21.03.2022, has observed that, on re-fixation of pay

scale and pension, there shall not be any recovery of the amount already paid to the retired employees.

20. The above noted claim petitions are, accordingly, disposed of in terms of common judgment rendered by the Hon'ble High Court on 14.06.2022, in WPSS No. 1593/2021, Balam Singh Aswal vs. Managing Director and others and connected writ petitions, which has been affirmed by the Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court on 04.04.2024, in Special Appeal No. 245/2022, Managing Director, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Dehradun and others vs. Ashok Kumar Saxena and connected Special Appeals.

21. Let copies of this judgment be placed on the files of Claim petitions No. 85/NB/SB/2022, Hemendra Singh Rawat; 86/NB/DB/2022, Surendra Singh; 87/NB/DB/2022, Lalit Lal Sah; 88/NB/DB/2022, Ramesh Chandra Singh; 89/NB/DB/2022, Lalit Mohan Chaudhary; 90/NB/DB/2022, Anoop Singh Bisht; and 91/NB/DB/2022, Kumar Dutt Bhatt.

(CAPT. ALOK SHEKHAR TIWARI)
MEMBER (A)

(JUSTICE U.C.DHYANI)
CHAIRMAN

DATE: SEPTEMBER 03, 2024
DEHRADUN

VM