



11:30:44 +0530

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 16136 OF 2025

1. Ashok Dattatreya Patil
Age: 66 Yrs., Occ. Retired
R/o. MIDC Road Vagholl,
Kamarle, Alibaug,
Dist. Raigarh, 402201
2. Smt. Sushma Damodar Sawant
Age. 57, Occ. Service,
R/o. Post - Khalapur,
Someshwar CHS. Ltd.
Tal. Khalapur, District: Raigad, 410202
3. Shri. Chandrakant Bhila Panpatil
Age. 60 Yrs, Occ. Retired,
R/o. Sabai Nagar, Khalapur,
Tal. Khalapur, Dist. Raigad
4. Shri. Rajendra Shamkant Chorghe
Age. 59 Yrs. Occ. Retired
R/o. 94, Bhavani Pakhadi,
Near Bhavani Mandir,
Dist. Raigad 402401
5. Shri. Chandrakant Raghunath Salve
Age. 56 Yrs, Occ. Service,
R/o. Pamchayat Samiti Khalapur,
Tal. Khalapur, Dist Raigad.
6. Smt. Vasudha Shrikrishna Patil
Age. 72 Yrs, Occ. Retired,
R/o. Pantnagar, Chendhare,
Alibag, Dist Raigad – 402201
7. Shri. Tanaji Chokhaji Thorat
Age. 76 yrs., Occ. Retired,
R/o. Thorat Niwas, Sudhagad,

Parali, Dist Raigad-410205.

8. Shri. Shashikant Sitaram Markande
Age. 68 Yrs, Occ. Retired,
R/o. Dabak Pakhadi, Shrivardhan,
District: Raigad – 402110
9. Shri Ganesh Naresh Palvankar
Earlier known as
Ganesh Naresh Kumbhar
Age. 66 Yrs, Occ. Retired,
R/o. Post-Amli Road,
Opp, Amli Primry School,
Walake, District: Raigad – 402202
10. Shri. Kashinath Narayan Raut
Age. 73 Yrs, Occ. Retired,
R/o. House No. 2258, Near Tulad
Devi Mandir, Chaul, Tulad Devi,
Alibaug, Post Chaul,
District: Raigad – 402203
11. Shri. Vishnu Vasant Mhatre
Age. 70 Yrs, Occ. Retired,
R/o. Mani Post-Thal, Alibag,
Dist Raigad 402207
12. Shri. Rambhau Hasha Mhatre
Age. 73 Yrs, Occ. Retired
R/o. Veena APT, Godavari Nagar
Chinchapada pen, Pen,
Tal. Pen, Dist. Raigad.
13. Shri. Avinash Kashiram Naik
Age. 65 Yrs, Occ. Retired,
Karla, Khandala, Alibaug,
Dist Raigad 402201
14. Shri. Sunil Jagram Chavan
Age. 49, Occ. Service,
R/o. Flat No. G-2, Pournima

CHS. Ltd., Neral Kalam Road,
Near Agri Samaj Hall,
Bopele, Neral, Dist Raigad.

15. Shri Manoranjan Shivaram Mane
Age: 56 Yrs., Occupation: Service
R/o. Post Dhakawade, Mandave,
Tal. Alibaug. Dist. Raigad.
16. Shri. Avinash Shivappa Kambale
Age. 66 Yrs., Occ. Retired,
R/o. Pamchayat Samiti
Uran, Tal. Uran, Dist Raigad.
17. Shri. Bhaulal Bhagu Rathod
Age: 56 Yrs., Occupation: Service
R/o. 202, Second floor,
Kumbhar Ali, R.G. Nagar, Neral,
Dist. Raigad
18. Shri. Santosh Jagannath Bodke.
Age: 50 Yrs., Occupation: Service
R/o. Flat no.6 Adyashakti CHS Ltd.
Hirawadi Road, Bappa Sitaram,
Shivam Nagar, Nashik, Dist. Nashik.
19. Shri. Suresh Bhaurao Shrote
Age. 54, Occ. Service,
R/o. A-4, Shivam Apl.,
Kacheri Road, Anand Nagar,
Karjat, Dist. Raigad
20. Shri. Nitin Ramchandra Patil
Age. 61 Yrs.,R/o. Ambepur,
Post Pozari, Tal. Alibaug,
Dist. Raigad.
21. Shri. Shabbir Karim Patel
Age. 54, Occ. Retired,
R/o. Custom Office Road,
Mandavi Mohalla, Alibaug,

Dist. Raigad

22. Smt. Mandakini Bajrang Sasane
Age. 68 Yrs, Occ. Retired,
R/o. Shri. Guruprasad Niwas,
Neral Pada Raod,
Near Nationalist Congress Office,
Neral, Dist. Raigad 410201
23. Yuvraj Jagatsingh Rajput
Age. 68 Yrs, Occ. Retired
R/o. Panchayat Samiti Khalapur,
Tal. Khalapur, Dist. Raigad 410201 ... Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Maharashtra Thro. Its
Secretary The Department of
General Administration
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032
2. The State Maharashtra
Through its Secretary,
Rural Development Department
Mantralaya, Mumbai
3. The Chief Executive Officer,
Zilla Parishad Raigad,
District: Raigad ... Respondents

**WITH
(507) WRIT PETITION NO. 17460 OF 2025**

1. Mr. Naresh Dattatrey Patil
Age: 54 Yrs., Occ. Service
R/o. Alibaug Tal. Alibaug
Dist. Raigad
2. Shri. Mahendra Balkrushna Palwankar
Age. 64, Occ. Retired,
R/o. Post- Borli Mandala Tal. Murud

Dist. Raigad

3. Shri. Vishnu Shankar Kamtekar
Since deceased through Legal Representative
Smt. Ujwala Vishnu Kamtekar
Age. 58 Yrs, Occ. Household,
R/o. Alibaug Tal. Alibaug
Dist. Raigad
4. Smt. Maya Dinesh Magar
Age. 63 Yrs. Occ. Retired
R/o. Alibaug Tal. Alibaug
Dist. Raigad
5. Shri. Sachin Bhiku Bhagat
Age. 48 Yrs, Occ. Service,
R/o. Shrivardhan, Tal. Shrivardhan,
Dist Raigad.
6. Shri. Rajan Mahadu Thale
Age. 52 Yrs, Occ. Service,
R/o. A/P Sudhagad Pali,
Tal. Sudhagad Pali, Dist Raigad
7. Shri. Dilipkumar Ganpat Patil
Since deceased through
Legal Representative
Smt. Nilam Dilipkumar Patil
Age. 54 yrs., Occ. Household,
R/o. A/P Alibaug, Tal. Alibaug
Dist Raigad.
8. Shri. Narayan Hira Rathod
Age. 52 Yrs, Occ. Service,
R/o. A/P Sudhagad Pali,
Tal. Sudhagad Pali, Dist Raigad
9. Shri. Rajendra Harishchandra Gaikwad
Age. 52 Yrs, Occ. Service,
R/o. A/P Alibaug, Tal.
Alibaug Dist Raigad.

10. Smt. Sujata Subhash Mhatre
Age. 56 Yrs, Occ. Service,
R/o. A/P Alibaug, Tal.
Alibaug Dist Raigad.
11. Shri. Premsing Macchindra Girase
Age. 53 Yrs, Occ. Service,
R/o. Karjat, Dist Raigad
12. Shri. Narayan Govind Keni
Age. 52 Yrs, Occ. Service
R/o. Panvel, Dist. Raigad.
13. Shri. Vijay Anandsing Rajput
Age. 54 Yrs, Occ. Service,
R/o. Karjat, Dist Raigad. ... Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Maharashtra Thro. Its
Secretary The Department of
General Administration
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032
2. The State Maharashtra
Through its Secretary,
Rural Development Department
Mantralaya, Mumbai
3. The Chief Executive Officer,
Zilla Parishad Raigad,
District: Raigad ... Respondents

Mr. Mahesh Rawool, Advocate for the Petitioners in both matters.

Mr. P. P. Kakade, Addl. GP a/w Ms. Nisha Mehra, AGP for Respondent – State in WP No. 16136 of 2025.

Ms. Priyanka Chavan, AGP for Respondent – State in WP No. 17460 of 2025.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND
ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.**

DATE : 22nd DECEMBER, 2025

ORAL JUDGMENT : (PER : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

1. Writ Petition No. 17460 of 2025 is not on board. On mentioning, taken on the production board.

2. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith and heard finally by the consent of the parties.

3. The learned Advocate for Petitioners submits, on instructions, that the challenge to the Government Resolutions (G.R.) dated 24th August, 2017 and 15th December, 2022, is not being pressed. The Petitioners pray that relief in terms of the existing G.R.s, which are considered in the final order dated 3rd December, 2024 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 19 of 2024 (***Shivram Shantaram More & Ors. v/s. State of Maharashtra & Ors.***), be granted.

4. The learned Additional G.P. submits that if the Petitioners are challenging the two G.R.s, the State will have to file an affidavit in reply.

5. Since the Petitioners are seeking relief in the light of the order dated 3rd December, 2024 in ***Shivram Shantaram More*** (Supra), and are not pressing their prayers against the GRs, the Petitions can be disposed off in terms of the said order.

6. The Petitioners are identically placed. All of them refer to the Government Resolution dated 24th August, 2017 insofar as grant of advance increment is concerned. By the said Government Resolution, a decision was taken not to continue with the benefit of advance increment during the 6th Pay Commission regime in between 1st October, 2006 to 1st October, 2015.

7. In various Judgments of this Court, it was consistently held that the Government Resolution dated 24th August, 2017, would operate prospectively and would not have the effect of retrospective denial of advance increments. The State Government and various Zilla Parishads had filed Review Petitions seeking review of various orders passed by this Court. It was *inter-alia* sought to be contended in the said Review Petitions that, even though the ultimate decision for stoppage of the scheme for advance increments might have been taken on 24th August, 2017, it was earlier directed by a Circular dated 3rd July, 2009, to

undertake the exercise of pay fixation as per the 6th Pay Commission Pay scales without taking into consideration the advance increments.

8. By Judgment and order dated 30th August, 2022, this Court has rejected the Review Petitions after considering all the objections raised by the State Government. It was held that, no specific instructions were issued before 24th August, 2017 for discontinuation of the scheme of advance increments. Paragraph Nos.12 to 15 of the Judgment and order dated 30th August, 2022, passed in Review Application (Civil) No.170 of 2022 in Writ Petition No.13760 of 2019 (***The State of Maharashtra and Anr. vs. Rupchand S/o. Narayan Shinde and Ors.***), read as under :

“12. After having heard learned Counsels at length, we find that the review applicants have not been able to point out any specific instructions issued prior to 24.08.2017/04.09.2018 for discontinuation of the schemes for grant of advance increments. Government Resolution dated 27.02.2009 and Circular dated 03.07.2009 do not indicate that any final decision was taken for discontinuation of schemes for advance increments. We proceed to examine the Government Resolution dated 27.02.2009 and Circular dated 03.07.2009 in details.

13. Government Resolution dated 27.02.2009 came to be issued by the State Government essentially for conveying the decision of the State Government about acceptance or otherwise of various recommendations made by the Hakim

Committee constituted for implementation of recommendations of the 6th Central Pay Commission. In Annexure to the said Government Resolution, each recommendation and decision of the State Government thereon have been enumerated. So far as the scheme for advance increment is concerned, the same is to be found at serial number 27 of the Annexure (para 3.24 of Committees Report). In that paragraph, the Committee recommended that for employees/ Officers rendering outstanding service, increment @ 4% be awarded instead of 3% and such increment be granted once in 5 years. It was further recommended that since increment at higher rate was being granted, the then existing scheme for grant of one or two advance increments be discontinued. However, in the column 'Decision of State Government' against para 3.24, remark is made stating that 'separate action would be taken by General Administration Department'. As against various other recommendations, the remark 'accepted' has been made. The recommendation made in para 3.24 by the Hakim Committee was not accepted at least on the date of issuance of Government Resolution dated 27.02.2009 and General Administration Department was to take a decision thereon separately. Thus, it cannot be inferred that any specific decision was taken by the State Government on 27.02.2009 for discontinuation of scheme for grant of advance increment. Therefore, we do not find that the orders under review need to be disturbed on the basis of the Government Resolution dated 27.02.2009.

14. Now, we come to the Circular dated 03.07.2009. By the said Circular, it was directed that the issue of discontinuation of scheme for grant of advance increment was under consideration with the State Government and that some time was required for taking final decision. Therefore, it was further directed that temporarily the pay

fixation of the employees in the 6th Pay Commission scales be made without considering the advance increments. Thus, the Circular dated 03.07.2009 was clearly issued as a temporary measure. The said circular did not communicate any decision to the effect that the State Government discontinued the scheme for grant of advance increments. Therefore, we find that the reliance of Mr. Dixit on the Circular dated 03.07.2009 is again of no avail.

15. We have carefully gone through the Government Resolution dated 24.08.2017 and Circular dated 04.09.2018. By the Government Resolution dated 24.08.2017, final decision came to be taken in respect of recommendation made by the Hakim Committee in para 3.24 of its report directing that during the period from 01.10.2006 to 01.10.2015 when revised pay scales as per 6th Pay Commission were admissible, the benefit of advance increments should not be granted. Thus, the final decision on para 3.24 of Committees Report was taken by the State Government only on 24.08.2017. However, instead of simply directing that the scheme for grant of advance increments is discontinued, the State Government sought to give retrospective effect to its decision by directing that the benefit of such advance increments be not given during the period from 01.10.2006 to 01.10.2015. While issuing such orders having retrospective effect, the State Government lost sight of the fact that several employees were already granted the benefit of advance increments during the relevant period. As we have observed earlier, the deliberations for discontinuation of the scheme started only on 27.02.2009/03.07.2009 and prior to that, admittedly, the issue of discontinuation of the scheme for grant of advance increment was not even under consideration. The instructions for temporarily doing pay fixation without advance increments were issued on 03.07.2009. This means that several employees must have

already been granted advance increments during the period from 01.10.2006 to 03.07.2009. We, therefore, fail to comprehend as to how the State Government could have issued directions on 24.08.2017 that the benefit of advance increments should not be granted from 01.10.2006 onwards. Even in respect of employees becoming eligible for grant of advance increments after 27.02.2009, we do not find any error in the view taken by this Court that the Government Resolution dated 27.08.2017 would only have prospective effect.”

9. Thus, it is now a well settled position that the scheme of grant of advance increments was discontinued for the first time by the Government Resolution dated 24th August, 2017 and that, such decision would only operate prospectively.

10. **These Writ Petitions are, therefore, disposed off** with the declaration that the Government Resolution dated 24th August, 2017, would apply prospectively. The Petitioners in these Petitions are held to be eligible for grant of advance increments for outstanding work, prior to 24th August, 2017. Since the Petitioners are not claiming interest, the recovered amount shall be paid to the Petitioners within a period of 45 days, failing which, the amount shall carry interest at the rate of 6% from the date of recovery, till it is actually paid. All consequential benefits be calculated by adding up the said advance increments. Since the

Petitioners have superannuated, all consequential benefits post recalculation, be paid to the Petitioners within 90 days.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)