

**BEFORE THE UTTARAKHAND PUBLIC SERVICES TRIBUNAL
AT DEHRADUN**

CLAIM PETITION NO. 29/SB/2024

Padmendra Singh Bartwal, aged about 61 years, s/o Late Sri Bahadur Singh Bartwal, Retd. Assistant Engineer, P.W.D., Uttarakhand, r/o House No. 87 Shanti Villa, Shatabdi Enclave, Ring Road, Lower Nathanpur, P.O. Nehrugram, Dehradun.

.....Petitioner

VS.

1. State of Uttarakhand through Secretary, Public Works Department, Govt. of Uttarakhand, Secretariat, Subhash Road, Dehradun.
2. Engineer-in-Chief and Head of the Department, Public Works Department, Uttarakhand, Yamuna Colony, Dehradun.
3. Chief Engineer, Office of Chief Engineer, Zonal Office, Public Works Department, Uttarakhand, Yamuna Colony, Dehradun.

.....Respondents.

Present: Sri L.K.Maithani, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Sri V.P.Devrani, A.P.O., for Respondents.

JUDGMENT

DATED: JANUARY 30, 2025.

Justice U.C.Dhyani (Oral)

By means of present claim petition, petitioner seeks the following reliefs:

“a) To quash the impugned office order dated 26.07.2023 with its effect and operation.

- b) To issue an order or direction to the concerned respondent to pay the interest as per GPF rate on the delayed payment of the amount of gratuity Rs. 9,66,173/- since the date of the retirement of the petitioner up to the date of actual payment i.e. 12.03.2024 and further on the amount of interest of gratuity calculated up to the date 12.03.2024 the interest be given to the petitioner.
- c) To issue an order or direction to the concerned respondent to return the recovered amount of gratuity Rs. 10,33,827/- to the petitioner with interest at the rate of 10% per annum since the date of his retirement up to the date of actual payment.
- d) To issue an order or direction to the concerned respondent to pay the amount of G.I.S. with interest at the rate of 10% per annum to the petitioner since the date of his retirement up to the date of actual payment.
- e) To issue any other suitable order or direction which this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.
- f) To award the cost of the petition to the petitioner.”

2. Petitioner retired as Assistant Engineer, Public Works Department on 31.05.2023. According to the petition, the petitioner was entitled for pension and other retiral dues, within time, as per Rules, namely, the Uttarakhand Pension Cases (Submission, Disposal And Avoidance of Delay) Rules, 2003. The respondents sanctioned and released the pension and gratuity belatedly on 12.03.2024 to the petitioner. Gratuity worth Rs.9,66,173/- was paid to him after recovery of Rs.10,33,827/-. The petitioner has given details of his entitlement in Para 4 (vii) to 4(xvii) of the petition. The Tribunal need not reproduce those averments as they are already part of record.

3. According to the petition, recovery of Rs. 10,33,827/- from the retiral dues of the petitioner was illegal. He is entitled to interest on delayed payment of retiral dues.

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

5. Claim petition has been contested on behalf of the respondents. Counter Affidavit has been filed by Sri Pranvir Singh, Assistant Engineer, Public Works Department, Dehradun, on behalf of

respondents. Relevant documents have been filed in support of Counter Affidavits.

6. In the C.A. thus submitted, it has been mentioned, among other things, that pursuant to G.O. dated 17.04.2015, service book of the petitioner was sent to the Finance Controller for verification of the pay fixation orders, as per Rules, before his superannuation on 31.05.2023. The Chief Engineer, Regional Office, P.W.D. sent a letter on 10.01.2023. The Department fixed (correct) salary of the petitioner. Original service book of the petitioner was returned to the Office of Chief Engineer, P.W.D. Salary of the petitioner was refixed from 30.08.1990, the date of substantive appointment of the petitioner in the department. Petitioner's salary was wrongly determined, which was corrected, inasmuch as 2nd and 3rd ACP were found to be wrongly given to the petitioner. Correct pay fixation order was issued after adjusting the over and excess payment made to the petitioner, as depicted in the G.O. dated 30.08.2023.

7. Ld. A.P.O. drew attention of the Bench towards Paras 8 and 9 of the Written Statement/ Counter Affidavit, to submit as to how departmental mistake was corrected while refixing the pay of the petitioner. Ld. A.P.O. also submitted that correct pay fixation is permissible in view of decision rendered by Hon'ble Supreme Court, on 21.03.2022 in Civil Appeal No.1985 of 2022, the State of Maharashtra and another vs. Madhukar Antu Patil and another. He also submitted that decision rendered in *State of Punjab vs. Rafiq Masih, (2015) 4 SCC 334* is not applicable to the petitioner inasmuch as he retired as a Class-II employee (Assistant Engineer) from the service of the respondent department.

8. Learned A.P.O. also submitted that the petitioner is not entitled to interest inasmuch as the petitioner was not entitled to keep the money, which was deducted from his gratuity. In fact, the petitioner himself should pay interest to the Govt. on the excess money which he was not entitled to keep.

9. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the claim petition is squarely covered by the decision rendered by the Tribunal on 08.08.2024 in Petition No.98/NB/SB/2022 Smt. Archana Shukla vs. State of Uttarakhand and others & number of other decisions including Claim Petition No. 122/NB/SB/2021 Sri Gauri Shankar Upadhyay vs. State & others; Claim Petition NO. 62/SB/2024 Smt. Meena Shah vs. State and others; Claim Petition NO. 95/SB/2024 Virendra Kumar Jadli vs. State and others and connected petitions.

10. The petitioner was given monetary benefit, which was in excess of his entitlement. The monetary benefit flowed to him consequent upon a mistake committed by the respondent department in determining the emoluments paid to him. According to the respondent department, it is a case of wrongful fixation of salary of the petitioner. The excess payment was made, for which petitioner was not entitled. Long and short of the matter is that the petitioner was in receipt of monetary benefit, beyond the due amount, on account of unintentional mistake committed by the respondent department.

11. Another essential factual component of this case is that the petitioner was not guilty of furnishing any incorrect information, which had led the respondent department to commit the mistake of making a higher payment to him. The payment of higher dues to the petitioner was not on account of any misrepresentation made by him, nor was it on account of any fraud committed by him. Any participation of the petitioner in the mistake committed by the employer, in extending the undeserved monetary benefit to the employee (petitioner), is completely ruled out. It would, therefore, not be incorrect to record, that the petitioner was as innocent as his employer, in wrongful determination of his inflated emoluments. The issue which is required to be adjudicated is, whether petitioner, against whom recovery (of the excess amount) has been made, should be exempted in law, from the reimbursement of the same to the employer. Merely on account of the fact that release of such monetary benefit was based on a mistaken belief at the hand of the employer, and further, because the employee (petitioner) had no role in determination of the salary, could it be legally feasible to the

employee (petitioner) to assert that he should be exempted from refunding the excess amount received by him?

12. In so far as the above issue is concerned, it is necessary to keep in mind that a reference, in a similar matter, was made by the Division Bench of two Judges of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rakesh Kumar vs. State of Haryana, (2014) 8 SCC 892, for consideration by larger Bench. The reference was found unnecessary and was sent back to the Division Bench of Hon'ble Apex Court for appropriate disposal, by the Bench of three Judges [State of Punjab vs. Rafiq Masih, (2014) 8 SCC 883]. The reference, (which was made) for consideration by a larger Bench was made in view of an apparently different view expressed, on the one hand, in Shyam Babu vs. Union of India, (1994) 2 SCC 521; Sahib Ram vs. State of Haryana, (1995) (Suppl) 1 SCC 18 and on the other hand in Chandi Prasad Uniyal vs. State of Uttarakhand, (2012) 8 SCC 417, in which the following was observed:

“14. We are concerned with the excess payment of public money which is often described as “tax payers money” which belongs neither to the officers who have effected over-payment nor that of the recipients. We fail to see why the concept of fraud or misrepresentation is being brought in such situations. Question to be asked is whether excess money has been paid or not may be due to a bona fide mistake. Possibly, effecting excess payment of public money by Government officers, may be due to various reasons like negligence, carelessness, collusion, favouritism etc. because money in such situation does not belong to the payer or the payee. Situations may also arise where both the payer and the payee are at fault, then the mistake is mutual. Payments are being effected in many situations without any authority of law and payments have been received by the recipients also without any authority of law. Any amount paid/received without authority of law can always be recovered barring few exceptions of extreme hardships but not as a matter of right, in such situations law implies an obligation on the payee to repay the money, otherwise it would amount to unjust enrichment.”

13. It may be noted here that the petitioners Chandi Prasad Uniyal and others were serving as Teachers, they approached Hon'ble High Court and then Hon'ble Supreme Court against recovery of overpayment due to wrong fixation of 5th and 6th Pay Scales of Teachers/ Principals, based on the 5th Pay Commission Report.

14. In the context noted above, Hon'ble Apex Court in Paragraphs 6, 7 & 8 of the decision rendered in State of Punjab vs. Rafiq Masih, (2015) 4 SCC 334, has observed thus:

“6. In view of the conclusions extracted hereinabove, it will be our endeavour, to lay down the parameters of fact situations, wherein employees, who are beneficiaries of wrongful monetary gains at the hands of the employer, may not be compelled to refund the same. In our considered view, the instant benefit cannot extend to an employee merely on account of the fact, that he was not an accessory to the mistake committed by the employer; or merely because the employee did not furnish any factually incorrect information, on the basis whereof the employer committed the mistake of paying the employee more than what was rightfully due to him; or for that matter, merely because the excessive payment was made to the employee, in absence of any fraud or misrepresentation at the behest of the employee.

7. Having examined a number of judgments rendered by this Court, we are of the view, that orders passed by the employer seeking recovery of monetary benefits wrongly extended to the employees, can only be interfered with, in cases where such recovery would result in a hardship of a nature, which would far outweigh, the equitable balance of the employer's right to recover. In other words, interference would be called for, only in such cases where, it would be iniquitous to recover the payment made. In order to ascertain the parameters of the above consideration, and the test to be applied, reference needs to be made to situations when this Court exempted employees from such recovery, even in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 142 of the Constitution of India. Repeated exercise of such power, "for doing complete justice in any cause" would establish that the recovery being effected was iniquitous, and therefore, arbitrary. And accordingly, the interference at the hands of this Court.

8. As between two parties, if a determination is rendered in favour of the party, which is the weaker of the two, without any serious detriment to the other (which is truly a welfare State), the issue resolved would be in consonance with the concept of justice, which is assured to the citizens of India, even in the Preamble of the Constitution of India. The right to recover being pursued by the employer, will have to be compared, with the effect of the recovery on the employee concerned. If the effect of the recovery from the employee concerned would be, more unfair, more wrongful, more improper, and more unwarranted, than the corresponding right of the employer to recover the amount, then it would be iniquitous and arbitrary, to effect the recovery. In such a situation, the employee's right would outbalance, and therefore eclipse, the right of the employer to recover.”

[Emphasis supplied]

15. 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. Petitioner's case is squarely covered by the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court. Recovery made from him is iniquitous or harsh to such an extent that it would far outweigh the equitable balance of employer's right to recover.

17. Petitioner is entitled to refund of the amount which has been deducted from his gratuity.

18. 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, decisions 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, in WPSS No. 1593 of 2021, Balam Singh Aswal vs. Managing Director and others and connected writ petitions on 14.06.2022 & in WPSS No. 363 of 2022 and connected petitions on 05.01.2024 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.

* * *

19. There is, however, no embargo on the respondent department against correct fixation of pay even 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]. Relevant paragraphs of the judgment read as below:

“5. The Division Bench has placed reliance upon a similar case decided by them earlier of one Smt. Omwati who had filed Writ - A No. 28420 of 2016 and the Court had observed that no recovery of excess payment can be made from the writ petitioner although the respondents may correct the pension that had been wrongly fixed for future disbursement to the widow. For this conclusion arrived at by this Court reliance was placed on the Supreme Court's decision in State of Punjab and others Vs. Rafiq Masih (White Washer) and Ors., (2015) 4 SCC 334.

6. It is undisputed that some excess payment has been made to the petitioner. If some correction has been done by the respondents, they are entitled to correct and refix the family pension as the Supreme Court has observed in several cases that administrative mistake regarding the pay fixation or family pension can be corrected by the authorities. However, in view of the law settled by the Supreme Court in Rafiq Masih (supra) no recovery of excess payment allegedly made to the petitioner already can be done from her.

7. This writ petition is disposed off with a direction to the respondents to pay the correctly fixed pension from December, 2018 onward to the petitioner and not to make recovery of alleged excess payment already made to the petitioner due to wrong pay fixation earlier.”

20. 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 as below:

“2. That respondent no.1 herein was initially appointed on 11.05.1982 as a Technical Assistant on work charge basis and continued on the said post till absorption. By G.R. dated 26.09.1989, 25 posts of Civil Engineering Assistants were created and respondent no.1 herein was absorbed on one of the said posts. Respondent no.1 was granted the benefit of first Time Bound

Promotion (for short, 'TBP') considering his initial period of appointment of 1982 on completion of twelve years of service and thereafter he was also granted the benefit of second TBP on completion of twenty four years of service. Respondent No.1 retired from service on 31.05.2013. After his retirement, pension proposal was forwarded to the Office of the Accountant General for grant of pension on the basis of the last pay drawn at the time of retirement.

2.1 The Office of the Accountant General raised an objection for grant of benefit of first TBP to respondent no.1 considering his date of initial appointment dated 11.05.1982, on the basis of the letter issued by Water Resources Department, Government of Maharashtra on 19.05.2004. It was found that respondent no.1 was wrongly granted the first TBP considering his initial period of appointment of 1982 and it was found that he was entitled to the benefit from the date of his absorption in the year 1989 only. Vide orders dated 06.10.2015 and 21.11.2015, his pay scale was down-graded and consequently his pension was also re-fixed.

2.2 Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied with orders dated 06.10.2015 and 21.11.2015 down-grading his pay scale and pension, respondent no.1 approached the Tribunal by way of Original Application No. 238/2016. By judgment and order dated 25.06.2019, the Tribunal allowed the said original application and set aside orders dated 06.10.2015 and 21.11.2015 and directed the appellants herein to release the pension of respondent no.1 as per his pay scale on the date of his retirement. While passing the aforesaid order, the Tribunal observed and held that respondent no.1 was granted the first TBP considering his initial period of appointment of 1982 pursuant to the approval granted by the Government vide order dated 18.03.1998 and the subsequent approval of the Finance Department, and therefore, it cannot be said that the benefit of the first TBP was granted mistakenly. The Tribunal also observed that the services rendered by respondent no.1 on the post of Technical Assistant (for the period 11.05.1982 to 26.09.1989) cannot be wiped out from consideration while granting the benefit of first TBP.

2.3 Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied with the judgment and order passed by the Tribunal, quashing and setting aside orders dated 06.10.2015 and 21.11.2015, refixing the pay scale and pension of respondent no.1, the appellants herein preferred writ petition before the High Court. By the impugned judgment and order, the High Court has dismissed the said writ petition. Hence, the present appeal.

3.

3.1

4. In the present case, as observed hereinabove, his initial appointment in the year 1982 was in the post of Technical Assistant on work charge basis, which was altogether a different post than the newly created post of Civil Engineering Assistant in which he was absorbed in the year 1989, which carried a different pay scale. Therefore, the department was right in holding that the contesting respondent was entitled to the first TBP on completion of twelve years from the date of his absorption in the year 1989 in the post of Civil Engineering Assistant. Therefore both, the High

Court as well as the Tribunal have erred in observing that as the first TBP was granted on the approval of the Government and the Finance Department, subsequently the same cannot be modified and/or withdrawn. Merely because the benefit of the first TBP was granted after the approval of the Department cannot be a ground to continue the same, if ultimately it is found that the contesting respondent was entitled to the first TBP on completion of twelve years of service only from the year 1989. Therefore both, the High Court as well as the Tribunal have committed a grave error in quashing and setting aside the revision of pay scale and the revision in pension, which were on re-fixing the date of grant of first TBP from the date of his absorption in the year 1989 as Civil Engineering Assistant.

5. However, at the same time, as the grant of first TBP considering his initial period of appointment of 1982 was not due to any misrepresentation by the contesting respondent and on the contrary, the same was granted on the approval of the Government and the Finance Department and since the downward revision of the pay scale was after the retirement of the respondent, we are of the opinion that there shall not be any recovery on re-fixation of the pay scale. However, the respondent shall be entitled to the pension on the basis of the re-fixation of the pay scale on grant of first TBP from the year 1989, i.e., from the date of his absorption as Civil Engineering Assistant.

6. In view of the above and for the reasons stated above, the present appeal succeeds in part. The impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court as well as that of the Tribunal quashing and setting aside orders dated 6.10.2015 and 21.11.2015 downgrading the pay scale and pension of the contesting respondent are hereby quashed and set aside. It is observed and held that the contesting respondent shall be entitled to the first TBP on completion of twelve years from the year 1989, i.e., from the date on which he was absorbed on the post of Civil Engineering Assistant and his pay scale and pension are to be revised accordingly. However, it is observed and directed that on re-fixation of his pay scale and pension, as observed hereinabove, there shall not be any recovery of the amount already paid to the contesting respondent, while granting the first TBP considering his initial appointment from the year 1982."

[Emphasis supplied]

21. A bunch of writ petitions has been decided by the Hon'ble High Court vide Judgment dated 14.06.2022, which was assailed by the Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Dehradun and others in Intra-Court Appeal. Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand decided Special Appeal No. 245/ 2022, Managing Director, Uttarakhand Transport Corporation, Dehradun and others vs. Ashok Kumar Saxena and connected Special Appeals, vide order dated 04.04.2024. The situation which is confronted by this Tribunal in present claim petition is covered by the judgment and

order dated 14.06.2022 rendered by Hon'ble High Court, which has been affirmed by Hon'ble Division Bench in Special Appeal No. 245 of 2022, *vide* order dated 04.04.2024.

* * *

22. The question, which arises for consideration of the Tribunal is - Whether the petitioner is entitled to interest on delayed payment of retiral dues?

23. In the decision of *D.D. Tiwari (D) Thr. Lrs. vs. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. and Others, 2014 (5) SLR 721 (SC)*, it was held by Hon'ble Supreme Court that retiral benefit is a valuable right of employee and culpable delay in settlement/ disbursement must be dealt with penalty of payment of interest. Regard may also be had to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in *S.K. Dua vs. State of Haryana and Another, (2008) 1 Supreme Court Cases (L&S) 563*, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that even in the absence of specific Rule or order for providing interest, an employee can claim interest on the basis of Articles 14,19 and 21 of the Constitution of India, as retirement benefits are not a bounty. The relevant paragraph of the judgment is being reproduced herein below for convenience:

*"14. "In the circumstances, prima facie, we are of the view that the grievance voiced by the appellant appears to be well founded that he would be entitled to interest on such benefits. **If there are statutory rules occupying the field, the appellant could claim payment of interest relying on such rules. If there are administrative instructions, guidelines or norms prescribed for the purpose, the appellant may claim benefit of interest on that basis. But even in absence of statutory rules, administrative instructions or guidelines, an employee can claim interest under Part III of the Constitution relying on Articles 14,19 and 21 of the Constitution. The submission of the learned counsel for the appellant, that retiral benefits are not in the nature Of "bounty" is, in our opinion, well founded and needs no authority in support thereof."***

24. Thus it is clear that the respondent department is liable to pay interest on delayed payment of retiral dues to the petitioner.

25. It is admitted that other retiral dues were paid to the petitioner well within time, only release of gratuity and G.I.S. was delayed. If G.I.S. has not been paid as yet, the petitioner is entitled to interest till the date of actual payment.

* * *

The next question is, what should be the amount of interest?

26. This Tribunal has taken a stand while deciding the claim petition No. 30/DB/2013, Dwarika Prasad Bhatt vs. State & others, on 22.09.2016 that interest on gratuity and amount of leave encashment should be given to the petitioner from a date, which will be after three months of his retirement till the date of actual payment. It has further been held in the claim petition of Dwarika Prasad Bhatt (*supra*) that the rate of interest shall be the simple rate of interest payable on General Provident Fund during the relevant period. This is based on Government Order No.979/XXVII(3)Pay/2004 dated 10.08.2004 issued by the Government of Uttarakhand. The Tribunal should, therefore, pass similar order in present claim petition also.

* * *

27. **Respondents are, accordingly, directed to pay to the petitioner:**

(i) Interest on the amount of gratuity (Rs.9,66,173/-) from 01.09.2023 till the date of actual payment;

(ii). If G.I.S. has not been paid as yet, the petitioner is entitled to interest on the amount of G.I.S. from 01.09.2023 till the date of actual payment.

The rate of interest shall be the simple rate of interest payable on General Provident Fund during the relevant period.

* * *

28. Petitioner also claims interest on delayed refund of the amount which was recovered from his gratuity.

29. Ld. A.P.O. submitted that petitioner is not entitled to interest inasmuch as the petitioner was not entitled to keep the money, which was deducted from his gratuity. In fact, the petitioner himself should pay interest to the Govt. on the excess money which he was not entitled to keep.

30. Hon'ble High Court, while deciding the bunch of writ petitions in WPSS No. 1593 of 2021, Balam Singh Aswal vs. Managing Director and others, nowhere directed the Respondent Corporation to pay interest while directing refund of recovery made from employee's retiral dues. Decision of Balam Singh Aswal was assailed by the Respondent Corporation in Intra Court appeal. The Division Bench did not interfere with the decision of Hon'ble Single Judge.

Even Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.1985 of 2022, State of Maharashtra and another vs. Madhukar Antu Patil and another decided on 21.03.2022, nowhere directed that the employee should get interest while directing the department to refund the deductions made from the employee's retiral dues.

31. Hence the petitioner, in the instant case, is not entitled to interest for the period which was taken by the Respondent department in refunding petitioner's recovered dues as per the direction of the Court/ Tribunal.

* * *

32. In such a situation, Ld. counsel for the petitioner submitted that present petition may be decided in terms of the aforesaid decisions (cited above), which is fairly agreed to by Ld. A.P.O., in the interest of justice.

33. **Claim petition is disposed of with the above observations and in terms of the decisions rendered by Hon'ble Apex Court in State of Punjab vs. Rafiq Masih, (2015) 4 SCC 334; in Civil Appeal No.1985 of 2022, the State of Maharashtra and another vs. Madhukar Antu Patil and another on 21.03.2022;**

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; and catena of other decisions rendered by Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand in recent past .

34. No order as to costs.

(JUSTICE U.C.DHYANI)
CHAIRMAN

DATE: JANUARY 30, 2025
DEHRADUN

VM