

Shobha Ram Raturi vs Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd.& Ors on 9 December, 2015

Equivalent citations: AIR 2016 SUPREME COURT 157, 2016 LAB. I. C. 536, AIR 2016 SC (CIVIL) 672, (2016) 1 SERV LJ 111, (2016) 2 LAB LN 565, 2016 (16) SCC 663, (2016) 1 SERV LR 494, (2016) 148 FACLR 553, (2016) 1 CURLR 228

Bench: Rohinton Fali Nariman, Jagdish Singh Khehar

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 11325 OF 2011

Shobha Ram Raturi

..Appellant

versus

Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited and others ..Respondents

O R D E R

It is not a matter of dispute, that the appellant was retired from service on 31.12.2002, even though he would have, in the ordinary course, attained his date of retirement on superannuation, only on 31.12.2005. The appellant assailed the order of his retirement dated 31.12.2002 by filing writ petition no. 751 of 2003. The same was allowed by a learned Single Judge of the Punjab and Haryana High Court, on 14.09.2010. The operative part of the order is extracted hereunder:

“Accordingly the present writ petition is allowed; order dated 31.12.2002 (Annexure P-4) is quashed. The petitioner would be treated to be in continuous service with all consequential benefits. However it is clarified that since the petitioner has not worked on the post maxim of “no work, no pay” shall apply and the consequential benefits shall only be determined towards terminal benefits. However there will be no order as to costs.” The denial of back wages to the appellant by the High Court vide its order dated 14.09.2010 was assailed by the appellant by filing Letters Patent Appeal No. 489 of 2011. The High Court rejected the claim of the appellant, while dismissing the Letters Patent Appeal on 26.5.2011. The orders dated 14.09.2010 and 26.5.2011 passed by the High Court limited to the issue of payment of back wages, are subject matter of challenge before this Court.

Having given our thoughtful consideration to the controversy, we are satisfied, that after the impugned order of retirement dated 31.12.2002 was set aside, the appellant was entitled to all consequential benefits. The fault lies with the respondents in not having utilised the services of the appellant for the period from 1.1.2003 to

31.12.2005. Had the appellant been allowed to continue in service, he would have readily discharged his duties. Having restrained him from rendering his services with effect from 1.1.2003 to 31.12.2005, the respondent cannot be allowed to press the self serving plea of denying him wages for the period in question, on the plea of the principle of "no work no pay".

For the reasons recorded hereinabove, we are satisfied, that the impugned order passed by the High Court, to the limited extend of denying wages to the appellant, for the period from 1.1.2003 to 31.12.2005 deserves to be set aside. The same is accordingly hereby set aside.

The appellant shall be paid wages for the above period within three months from today. His retiral benefits, if necessary, shall be re- calculated on the basis thereof, and shall be released to him within a further period of three months.

The instant appeal is allowed in the above terms.

.....J.
[JAGDISH SINGH KHEHAR]

NEW DELHI;

.....J.

DECEMBER 09, 2015. [ROHINTON FALI NARIMAN] ITEM NO.116 COURT NO.3 SECTION IV S
U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS Civil Appeal No(s). 11325/2011
SHOBHA RAM RATURI Appellant(s) VERSUS HARYANA VIDYUT PRASARAN NIGAM LTD.&
ORS Respondent(s) Date : 09/12/2015 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGDISH SINGH KHEHAR HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE
ROHINTON FALI NARIMAN For Appellant(s) Ms. V.S. Lakshmi, Adv.

for Mr. A. Venayagam Balan,AOR For Respondent(s) Mr. Sanjay Kumar Visen,Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following O R D E R The appeal is
allowed in terms of the signed order.

(Renuka Sadana)
Court Master

(Parveen Kr. Chawla)
AR-cum-PS

[signed order is placed on the file]