

**THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH,**

**BENCH AT GWALIOR**

**WP-18432-2021**

***(Ram Prasad Vs. State of M.P. & Ors.)***

**Gwalior, Dated : 23/09/2021**

Shri B.P. Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Rohit Mishra, learned Additional Advocate General for the respondents/State.

The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India prays for the following relief:

“(i) That, a direction may kindly be given to the respondents to pay the minimum of pay in the graded pay scale of the post of Carpenter to the petitioner from the date of his classification till 31/08/2016 as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Ram Naresh Rawat.

(ii) Any other relief, which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper, may also be given to the petitioner..”

Petitioner who happens to be a Carpenter submits that despite having been classified as a permanent employee, no benefit of regular pay scale has been extended to him.

It is submitted by the counsel for the petitioner that identical petitions have already been disposed of by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court by order dated 05/09/2018 passed in W.P. No.20650/2018, relevant portion whereof reads as under :-

“The law in regard to the benefits flowing from an order of classification is now settled in view of the decision of Apex Court in the case of **Ram Naresh Rawat Vs. Ashwini Ray reported in 2017 (Vol 3) SCC 436**, relevant

**THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH,**

**BENCH AT GWALIOR**

**WP-18432-2021**

***(Ram Prasad Vs. State of M.P. & Ors.)***

extract of which is reproduced below for convenience and ready reference:

4..... The precise submission is that once they are conferred the status of permanent employee by the court and it is also categorically held that they are entitled to regular pay attached to the said post, not only the pay should be fixed in the regular pay scale, the petitioners would also be entitled to the increments and other emoluments attached to the said post.

18. Insofar as petitioners before us are concerned they have been classified as 'permanent'. For this reason, we advert to the core issue, which would determine the fate of these cases, viz., whether these employees can be treated as 'regular' employees in view of the aforesaid classification? In other words, with their classification as 'permanent', do they stand regularized in service?

26. From the aforesaid, it follows that though a 'permanent employee' has right to receive pay in the graded pay-scale, at the same time, he would be getting only minimum of the said pay-scale with no increments. It is only the regularization in service which would entail grant of increments etc. in the pay-scale.

27. In view of the aforesaid, we do not find any substance in the contentions raised by the petitioners in these contempt petitions. We are conscious of the fact that in some cases, on earlier occasions, the State Government while fixing the pay scale, granted increments as well. However, if some persons are given the benefit wrongly, that cannot form the basis of claiming the same relief. It is trite that right to equality under Article 14 is not in negative terms (See. Indian Council of Agricultural Research & Anr. Vs. T.K. Suryanarayan & Ors.).

28. These contempt petitions are, accordingly, dismissed”.

**THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH,**

**BENCH AT GWALIOR**

**WP-18432-2021**

***(Ram Prasad Vs. State of M.P. & Ors.)***

In view of above, it is directed that in case it is found that the classification of the petitioner is intact, the petitioner shall be paid minimum of the pay scale admissible to the post on which he has been classified as permanent employee without any increment. If any arrears are worked out, the same shall be paid as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of three months.

With the aforesaid directions, the instant petition stands **disposed of.**

Certified copy as per rules.

**(S.A. Dharmadhikari)**  
**Judge**

**rahul**