HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH: JABALPUR FULL BENCH - I (Time 11:00 AM)

Daily Cause List dated: 19-07-2018

BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIJAY KUMAR SHUKLA & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SANJAY **DWIVEDI**

Court Room No.: 1

Note:- CASES FOR FINAL HEARING SHALL BE TAKEN UP BY ALL THE BENCHES IMMEDIATELY AFTER COMPLETION OF MOTION HEARING.

MOTION HEARING

Petitioner/Respondent Advocate

[ORDERS]

1	WA 00815/2017	THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH Versus	ADVOCATE GENERAL, GIRISH PRAKASH KEKRE[AG]
		JAGDISH PRASAD DUBEY	, M R VERMA[R-1], KAILASH CHANDRA GHILDIYAL[R-1], ANIRUDDHA PRASAD PANDEY[R-1], AMIT KUMAR CHATURVEDI[R-1]
		Relief - TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DTD. 17/08/16, PASS {Fixed Date/SPC} FOR CONSIDERATION OF TO ORDERED TO BE AFFECTED FROM THE PENSUNDERTAKING OR INDEMNITY BOND TAKEN REFIXATION. 2. WHETHER THE RECOVERY CEXERCISE OF POWER CONFERRED UNDER FOR THE UNDERTAKING SOUGHT AT THE TIME COPAY IS A FORCED UNDERTAKING AND THUS (1986) 3 SCC 136 (CENTRAL INLAND WATER GANGULY AND ANOTHER). 4. ANY OTHER Q	ent Benefit Cum Pension-17139 - Recovery/Withholding of Pension ED IN W.P. 12950/14, ANNEX. WA/1. THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS: 1. WHETHER THE RECOVERY CAN BE SIONARY BENEFITS OR FROM THE SALARY IN VIEW OF AN N BY THE EMPLOYER BEFORE THE GRANT OF BENEFIT OF PAY ON ACCOUNT OF EXCESS PAYMENT TO AN EMPLOYEE CAN BE MADE IN RULE 65 OF M.P CIVIL SERVICES PENSION RULES, 1976. 3. WHETHER OF GRANT OF FINANCIAL BENEFITS ON ACCOUNT OF REFIXATION OF NOT ENFORCEABLE IN LIGHT OF JUDGMENT OF SUPREME COURT IN TRANSPORT CORPORATION LIMITED AND ANOTHER VS. BROJO NATH UESTION WHICH IS RAISED FOR DECISION BEFORE THE LARGER BENCH S ARISING OUT OF THE ISSUES CANVASSED] FOR STAY APPLICATION ON
1.1	Connected WA 01033/2017	THE STATE OF MADHAY DRADESH	
		Versus	
		CHHOTE LAL RAJAK	, SACHIN PANDEY[R-1]
		SERVICE RELATING TO STATE GOVT17100 - Retirement Benefit Cum Pension-17139 - Recovery/Withholding of Pension Relief - TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DT. 24.06.2016 {Fixed Date/SPC} FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS: 1. WHETHER THE RECOVERY CAN BE ORDERED TO BE AFFECTED FROM THE PENSIONARY BENEFITS OR FROM THE SALARY IN VIEW OF AN UNDERTAKING OR INDEMNITY BOND TAKEN BY THE EMPLOYER BEFORE THE GRANT OF BENEFIT OF PAY REFIXATION. 2. WHETHER THE RECOVERY ON ACCOUNT OF EXCESS PAYMENT TO AN EMPLOYEE CAN BE MADE IN EXERCISE OF POWER CONFERRED UNDER RULE 65 OF M.P. CIVIL SERVICES PENSION RULES, 1976. 3. WHETHER THE UNDERTAKING SOUGHT AT THE TIME OF GRANT OF FINANCIAL BENEFITS ON ACCOUNT OF REFIXATION OF PAY IS A FORCED UNDERTAKING AND THUS NOT ENFORCEABLE IN LIGHT OF JUDGMENT OF SUPREME COURT IN (1986) 3 SCC 136 (CENTRAL INLAND WATER TRANSPORT CORPORATION LIMITED AND ANOTHER VS. BROJO NATH GANGULY AND ANOTHER). 4. ANY OTHER QUESTION WHICH IS RAISED FOR DECISION BEFORE THE LARGER BENCH OR WHICH THE LARGER BENCH CONSIDERS ARISING OUT OF THE ISSUES CANVASSED]	
1.2	Connected WP 12293/2018 (S)	RAM SUFAL NUT	AMIT KUMAR CHATURVEDI
		Versus	
		THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH	ADVOCATE GENERAL
		Relief - QUASH THE OFFENDING PORTION OF PENSION	ent Benefit Cum Pension-17139 - Recovery/Withholding of Pension N PAYMENT ORDER DT.30/09/2017 (ANN.P-1) EFFECTING THE RECOVERY
TOTAL CASES · 3 (with connected matters)			

TOTAL CASES: 3 (with connected matters)

Case No

WA 00815/2017

Petitioner / Respondent

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

PR (J) / R (J-I) / R(J-II)