

## Meera Singh Vs Deepak Kumar And Ors

**Court:** Supreme Court Of India

**Date of Decision:** Jan. 8, 2025

**Hon'ble Judges:** J. K. Maheshwari, J; Rajesh Bindal, J

**Bench:** Division Bench

**Advocate:** Neeraj Shekhar

**Final Decision:** Disposed Of

### Judgement

J. K. Maheshwari, J

1. The petitioner in the present contempt petition is aggrieved by the alleged non-compliance of the order dated 27.02.2019 passed in Contempt

Petition (C) No. 1030 of 2018, filed in Civil Appeal No. 2703 of 2017 and batch titled as "Krishna Nand Yadav & others Vs. Magadh University &

others".

2. Briefly put, the petitioner, was, appointed, on the post of lecturer in Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur, Bihar w.e.f. 07.09.1981.

The claim of the petitioner regarding absorption was allowed by Mr. Justice S.B. Sinha (Retd.) One Man Commission (hereinafter referred to as "Sinha Commission").

Sinha Commission vide order dated 03.08.2015. The said order was confirmed by this Court vide order dated 31.08.2017 in Krishna Nand

Yadav (supra), subject to furnishing declaration by the petitioner regarding continuously working and attending the college regularly since the date of

appointment till date, or in case of retirement till the date of retirement and that she did not work anywhere else. Vide a notification dated 17.09.2018

of the Magadh University, she was absorbed.

3. The petitioner felt that the said order was not complied with, hence, she had filed the Contempt Petition (C) No. 1030 of 2018 for alleged non-

compliance. On 27.02.2019, the Court observed that absorption has been ordered and the payment to the admitted claim has also been made, if there

are any remaining arrears it be paid to petitioner after verification within four weeks. In this view, accepting unconditional apology, the Contempt

Petition was disposed of. The petitioner raising a grievance that the direction issued in main case and also in contempt petition has not been complied,

hence, filed the present petition.

4. In the present case, the State of Bihar filed counter affidavit stating that ascertainable arrears of salary of actual working days have been paid. It is

also said that pursuant to the orders dated 11.07.2019 and 07.08.2019 passed in Contempt Petition (C) No. 1188 of 2018 Baidya Nath Choudhary

Vs. Dr. Sree Surendra Kumar Singh, two members enquiry committee was not in a position to verify the absence period and the actual working

period, therefore, for demand of arrears of salary, no case of deliberate or willful non-compliance can be made out.

5. Having considered the submissions, undisputedly, after order of J. Sinha Commission, the petitioner's absorption was notified on 17.09.2018. As

contended, the ascertainable arrears of salary were also paid. She has already attained the age of superannuation on 31.12.2019. In view of the orders

dated 11.07.2019 and 07.08.2019 of this Court in Baidya Nath Choudhary (supra), her pension was put on hold by university vide order dated

03.06.2020. Thus, the issue of payment of arrears of salary verifying the absence period and actual working days after an enquiry is an issue and the

pension stopped is also an issue which require adjudication.

6. In view of the factual scenario of the matter and the tenor of the orders passed in subsequent proceedings in Baidya Nath Choudhary (supra), we

find that the issue regarding actual working of the petitioner, payment of salary and arrears thereof require adjudication after fact-finding enquiry,

which we are not inclined to hold in this Contempt Petition. So far as stoppage of pension is concerned, we make it clear that in the orders dated

11.07.2019, 07.08.2019 and 12.02.2021, the issue regarding payment of pension was not an issue. These orders relate to the fact that the absorbed

employees have received the salaries for the period in which they have not actually worked. Therefore, the Court directed for no further payment

even for pension. It is not reported that affording opportunity, enquiry has been completed, however, we do not deem it appropriate to keep these

matters pending.

7. As per above discussions, in our view, it would be appropriate to direct the authorities to adjudicate all the said issues through Registrar/Vice

Chancellor in view of the judgment of State of Bihar & others vs Bihar Rajya M.S.E.S.K.K.M & others (2005) 9 SCC 129 and accordingly, we

dispose of this petition with the following directions:

(i) The petitioner shall submit her claim along with relevant documents setting up her actual working in college in terms of the orders of absorption claiming salary,

and also for pension from the date of absorption upto February 28, 2025 before the Registrar/Vice Chancellor of the University.

(ii) On receiving the claim of salary, a discrete enquiry be held affording due opportunity to the employee, college concerned and the representative of the State if

required, and a reasoned order be passed regarding payment of salary and arrears, if any, within a period of three months thereafter.

(iii) The claim regarding pension of petitioner which has been withheld be decided counting the period of service, w.e.f. date of absorption notionally uninfluenced by

the orders dated 11.07.2019, 07.08.2019 and 12.02.2021 passed in Contempt Petition (C) No. 1188 of 2018 in Baidya Nath Choudhary (supra).

(iv) After adjudicating the issue of pension and arrears the same be paid adjusting the amount already paid as expeditiously as possible not later than two months

from the date of such order.

(v) Upon adjudication, if it is found that any excess amount has been paid either in the head of salary or pension, it be quantified and the university/college/state as

the case may be, shall be at liberty to take recourse to recover the same following the procedure as prescribed.

(vi) WeÃ, makeÃ, itÃ, clearÃ, thatÃ, ifÃ, theÃ, employeesÃ, have submitted the joint claim of arrears of salary and pension, in that event the issue of arrears of

salary be governed by direction No. (ii) and pension be governed by direction (iii).

(vii) In case, the parties feel dissatisfied by the orders of the Registrar/Vice Chancellor of the University, they shall be at liberty to take recourse as permissible before

the High Court.

8. In view of the foregoing, the present contempt petition stands disposed of. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, stands disposed of.