

Supreme Court of India

H.P. State Cement Corpn. Ltd. & Ors vs B.K. Tiwari on 11 December, 1997

Author: D Wadhwa

Bench: D.P. Wadhwa, A.P. Mishra

PETITIONER:

H.P. STATE CEMENT CORPN. LTD. & ORS.

Vs.

RESPONDENT:

B.K. TIWARI

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 11/12/1997

BENCH:

D.P. WADHWA, A.P. MISHRA

ACT:

HEADNOTE:

JUDGMENT:

J U D G M E N T D.P. Wadhwa, J.

Special Leave granted.

This appeal is directed against the judgment dated April 4, 1977 of Division Bench of the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad allowing the writ petition of the respondent whereby he was held entitled to the benefits of the revised pay scale and designation of the post he was holding.

In pursuance to an advertisement issued by the appellant the respondent applied for a post of Manager (Personnel) Grade E4 by letter dated May 1, 1986. He was, however, offered the post of Deputy Manager (P & IR) on terms and conditions as mentioned in letter dated October 23, 1986 of the appellant. The respondent declined this post stating that he had applied for the post of Manager (P & IR) and could not accept the post of Deputy Manager (P & IR ). This was by letter dated November 5, 1986. In the meanwhile, there was revision of pay scales of the officers and staff of the appellant, which was communicated to the appellant by letter dated November 12, 1986 of the State Government. The relevant part of the revision of pay scales is as under: <sls>  
"----- SL. Designation Pay Scales Designation Pay  
Scales No. (In Rs.) (In Rs.)

-----

3. Dy. Manager\ 1400-1800 Manager 1500-60- Sr. Dy. Manager (works) 1800-100-  
Manager 2000

4. Manager / 1500-2000 Joint Sr. 1800-100-

Company	Manager	2000 - 125 -
Secretary	(Works) /	2 - 2250
	Company	2 - 2250
	Secretary	

-----"

Then comes the appointment letter issued to the respondent. This letter is in brief and we merely produce the same as under:

"Gram: UP CEMENT CHURK

-----

The Uttar Pradesh State Cement Corporation Ltd. (AUP Govt. Undertaking) Registered Post (Seal)  
UNIT: CHURK CEMENT FACTORY.

-----

REGD. OFFICE CHURK 231206 Dept: Ref No. PS/HQ/R-10/1038 Dated: December 4, 1986

----- To.

Shri B.K. Tiwari, 120, Vindhreshni Nagar, Orderly Bazar, Varanasi Cantt., 221 002.

Sub: Offer of Appointment for the Post of Manager (Personnel & IR)

----- Dear Sir, Please refer to your letter No. NIL of dated 5th  
November, 1986 on the above subject. After due consideration it has been decided to amend your  
appointment offer to the following extent.

1. Your designation is hereby amended as Manager (Personnel & IR).
2. Your basic pay will be Rs. 1,500/- per month in the scale of pay of Rs. 1500-60-1800-100-2000.
3. Your joining time is hereby extended up to 15th February, 1987. No further extension will be granted.

All other terms and conditions of our appointment offer No. PS/HQ/R-10/872 dated 23.10.1986 remain unaltered.

Yours faithfully Sd/- (N.M. Majumdar) Chairman and Managing Director"

The respondent accepted the offer given to him by the aforesaid appointment letter and accepted the post of the Manager (P & IR). He joined this post on February 28, 1987 and on April 24, 1987 represented to the appellant that he was entitled to placement in the revised grade of Rs. 1800-2250/- which according to him was applicable to Manager (P & IR) Head Quarter. This representation was rejected and this led to filing of the writ petition by the respondent in the High Court which was allowed as aforesaid.

We do not think there is much controversy involved in the present case. The respondent said that at the time when he had applied for the post of Manager (E-4) it was in the pay scale of Rs. 1500-2000/- and what was offered to him was the post of Deputy Manager in the pay scale of Rs. 1400- 1800/-. Thus, according to the respondent, when he was offered the post of Manager, the pay scale had already been revised to Rs. 1800-2250/- to which, he said, he was entitled to. We don't think this contention of the respondent can be accepted. Letter offering him the appointment of Manager is specific. This letter, as noted above, was written after the revision of pay scales. Not only that, the letter mentioning the designation of the respondent had also, in clear terms, mentioned the pay scale of the Manager which was being offered to him.

This letter was accepted by the respondent with the terms and conditions therein. The respondent cannot read in the letter more than what it says. Offer or appointment was given to the respondent after revision of the pay scales and the appellant could not possibly had given the old pay scales. We, therefore, do not accept the view taken by the High Court.

We, accordingly, set aside the impugned judgment of the High Court and dismiss the writ petition filed by the respondent. The appeal is allowed with no order as to costs.