

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 23/10/2025

Hari Ram Shukla and Others Vs UOI and Others

Writ Petition (C) 9981 of 2009

Court: Delhi High Court

Date of Decision: July 3, 2013

Hon'ble Judges: V. Kameswar Rao, J; Pradeep Nandrajog, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: T.D. Yadav, for the Appellant;

Judgement

Pradeep Nandrajog, J.

The petitioners are blind persons. They are skilled workman. They are experts in the trade of weaving cane

furniture. Appointed in the Ministry of Defence on various dates they were placed in the pay scale applicable to semi-skilled workman which we

note was in the pay scale Rs. 210-290 when the recommendations of the 3rd Pay Commission were in force; replacement scale became Rs. 800-

1150 when the 4th Pay Commission's recommendations were implemented. The applicable pay scale for skilled workman being Rs. 260-400 and

Rs. 950-1500 respectively. Being blind and hence not being able to socialize with their brethren and not being aware that skilled

required to be placed in the pay scale Rs. 260-400, the petitioners were happy receiving salary in the pay scale Rs. 210-290 and its replacement

pay scale till they learnt of being discriminated against. Petitioners filed OA No. 804/1998 praying that instead of paying them salary in the pay

scale Rs. 800-1150 they should be paid salary in the pay scale Rs. 950-1500, which was allowed vide order dated September 15, 2000; but

regretfully with a declaratory relief. The Tribunal directed the Department to look into the nature of skill required in discharge of their work by the

petitioners ignoring that in other organizations craftsmen in the trade of cane weaving had already succeeded in they being required to be treated as

skilled workmen and paid salary in the pay scale applicable to skilled workmen.

2. Decision dated September 15, 2000 attained finality since writ petition filed by Union of India challenging the same was dismissed by a Division

Bench of this Court on May 15, 2002 and the Supreme Court refused to grant Leave to Appeal.

3. Left with no option, the Ministry of Defence passed an order granting pay scale applicable to skilled workmen which was Rs. 3050-4590 as

per the recommendations of the 5th Central Pay Commission implemented in the year 1996. This compelled the respondents to re-visit the

Tribunal. They filed OA No. 824/2006 praying that arrears should be paid to them by directing retrospective application of the order passed by

the Ministry of Defence. Vide impugned decision dated February 02, 2007 the Tribunal held that the claim of the respondents was justified but

direction issued was to notionally place petitioners in the pay scale applicable to skilled workmen with effect from November 01, 1982, which

scale was Rs. 950-1500 or from the date when petitioners were appointed; whichever is later. Arrears were directed to be paid for a period of

one year prior to the date when OA No. 824/2006 was filed. Review filed by the petitioners was disposed of by the Tribunal correcting

typographic errors in its order. The order in review is dated March 20, 2008.

4. Though not stated with reasons, the only reason we can decipher for the Tribunal directing notional pay fixation with effect from November 01.

1982 is that the Central Administrative Tribunal was constituted with effect from November 01, 1985 and the claim being a monitory claim, was

restricted by the Tribunal for a period three years preceding its formation and as regards restricting actual payment to a period of one year

preceding filing of OA No. 824/2006 the Tribunal has been influenced by the fact that limitation to institute proceedings before the Tribunal is one

year from when cause of action accrues.

5. The Tribunal has overlooked the fact that the petitioners made a claim before it for being paid salary in the pay scale applicable to skilled

workman in the year 1998 when OA No. 804/1998 was filed and unfortunately for the petitioners the Tribunal granted a declaratory relief

requiring the Ministry of Defence to pass a reasoned order, which was passed by the Ministry granting placement in the pay scale applicable to

skilled workman; but prospectively. This necessitated petitioners re-approaching the Tribunal and thus the Tribunal fell into error in ignoring the

past events. The second Original Application filed by the petitioners could be seen to be an extension of a right under a continuing cause of action.

6. When writ petitioners filed OA No. 804/1998 and had the Tribunal not being pedantic, relief which would have flown to the writ petitioners was

to be placed in the pay scale applicable to skilled workman with actual benefit of arrears restricted to a period of three years prior to filing of OA

No. 804/1998. Courts have consistently taken a view that pertaining to a continuing cause of action the bar of limitation would not be applicable

and if success results in money being payable the quantum can be restricted to a period of three years from when the Court was approached.

7. The matter can be looked at from another angle. The direction issued by the Tribunal as per its decision dated September 15, 2000 was to

consider the claim of the petitioner in light of various decisions whereunder cane man were held to be skilled workman and directed to be paid

salary in the scale applicable to skilled workman. The declaratory relief granted to the petitioners required the Ministry of Defence to pass legal

orders. In a country governed by the Rule of Law even a declaratory decree can be executed against the Government; although a declaratory

decree may be unexecutable vis- $\tilde{A}^-\hat{A}_{\dot{c}}\hat{A}'_2$ -vis a private individual. Thus, as long as the spirit of the order dated September 15, 2000 was not satisfied a

judicial Fora would be obliged to issue such directions as would satisfy the spirit of the said order.

8. The spirit of the order dated September 15, 2000 is to place the petitioners in the pay scale applicable to skilled workman. While doing so, time

barred claims could be withheld. Thus, the least which the petitioners would be entitled to would be arrears for a period of three years reckoned

from the date when OA No. 804/1998 was filed.

9. Noting that the Tribunal has already granted notional benefit of pay fixation to the petitioners in the pay scale applicable to a skilled workman

reckoned from the date petitioners joined service or from November 01, 1982 whichever is later, maintaining the same, we modify the impugned

order in so far payment of arrears has been restricted to a period of one year reckoned from the date when OA No. 824/2006 was filed and

direct that arrears would be paid to the petitioners effective from a date reckoned three years prior to when OA No. 804/1998 was filed.

10. Compliance be made within 8 weeks from today failing which the amount payable shall be paid to the petitioner with interest @ 8% (simple)

per annum. No costs.