

Jose

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

**MISC. CIVIL APPLICATION NO.121 OF 2024
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.1076 OF 2019**

MARIA EDUARDA MENEZES

... Applicant/
Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THR. THE
CHIEF SECRETARY AND 2 ORS.

... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.1074 OF 2019**

VISHWAS K. NAYAK

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THR. THE
CHIEF SECRETARY AND 2 ORS.

... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.1075 OF 2019**

SUKANTI M. KHOLKAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THR. THE
CHIEF SECRETARY AND 2 ORS.

... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.1077 OF 2019**

KHUSHALI G. P. DESSAI

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THR. THE
CHIEF SECRETARY AND 2 ORS.

... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.1078 OF 2019**

MAMATA M. NAIK

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THR. THE
CHIEF SECRETARY AND 2 ORS.

... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.1079 OF 2019**

SAVIO CLAUDIO MIGUEL MENDONCA

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THR. THE
CHIEF SECRETARY AND 2 ORS.

... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.1080 OF 2019**

APEKSHA P. PAWAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THR. THE
CHIEF SECRETARY AND 2 ORS.

... Respondents

Mr Parag Rao with Mr Ajay Menon, Advocates *for the Petitioners.*

Mr D. Pangam, Advocate General with Mr Deep Shirodkar, Additional Government Advocate *for the Respondent-State in WP No.1076/2019 and MCA No.121/2024.*

Mr D. Pangam, Advocate General with Mr S.P. Munj, Additional Government Advocate *for the Respondent-State in WP No.1074/2019.*

Mr D. Pangam, Advocate General with Ms Sapna Mordekar, Additional Government Advocate *for the Respondent-State in WP No.1075/2019.*

Mr D. Pangam, Advocate General with Mr Tukaram Gawas, Additional Government Advocate *for the Respondent-State in WP No.1077/2019.*

Mr D. Pangam, Advocate General with Mr Suhas Parab, Additional Government Advocate *for the Respondent-State in WP No.1078/2019.*

Mr D. Pangam, Advocate General with Mr Geetesh Shetye, Additional Government Advocate *for the Respondent-State in WP No.1079/2019.*

Mr D. Pangam, Advocate General with Ms Akshata Bhat, Additional Government Advocate *for the Respondent-State in WP No.1080/2019.*

**CORAM: M.S. SONAK &
VALMIKI MENEZES, JJ.**

DATED: 16th April 2024

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr Parag Rao who appears with Mr Ajay Menon for the Petitioners. Mr D. Pangam, learned Advocate General appears with Mr S.P. Munj, Ms Sapna Mordekar, Mr Deep Shirodkar, Mr Tukaram Gawas, Mr Suhas Parab, Mr Geetesh Shetye and Ms Akshata Bhat, Additional Government Advocates, for the Respondents.
2. The main issue involved in this petition was the implementation of recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission to the employees of Institute of Public Assistance (Provedoria).
3. The Petitioners contend that Provedoria is nothing but a Department of the State Government and therefore, the benefit of the 7th Pay Scales should even extend to its employees at par with employees of other Government Departments.

4. The record shows that the benefit of the 7th Pay Scales has been extended to the employees of the Provedoria effective from 01.11.2018. The Petitioners however contend that such benefits should even extend to them effective from 01.01.2016 because this was the date from which such benefits were extended to the employees of all other Government Departments.

5. Dealing with an almost similar contention, this Court, by its Judgment and Order dated 27.03.2024 in Writ Petition No.481/2022 had granted the Petitioners there liberty to represent to the Government and the Government was directed to dispose of such representation within three months.

6. Therefore, by adopting the same approach to this matter, we grant the Petitioners liberty to make detailed representation to the Government within a month from today, seeking implementation of the 7th Pay Scales/benefits from 01.01.2016 instead of 01.11.2018. If such representation is made within a month from today, we direct the State Government to consider such representation in accordance with law and on its own merits and dispose it of within three months of the receipt of last of such representations. The State Government must convey its decision to the Petitioners within this period of three months. In case the Petitioners are not satisfied with the decision, it is open for them to pursue such remedies as may be available to them.

7. All contentions of all parties are expressly left open to be decided by the State Government in the first instance.

8. With the above direction, all these petitions are disposed of. There shall be no order for costs. All concerned to act on an authenticated copy of this order.

9. The Miscellaneous Applications do not survive the disposal of these petitions. Accordingly, even the Miscellaneous Applications are disposed of.

VALMIKI MENEZES, J.

M.S. SONAK, J.