

GAHC010117662015



IN THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM & ARUNACHAL PRADESH)
PRINCIPAL SEAT
W.P(C) No. 3657/2015

Md. Siddique Ali,

Son of Lt. Nalo Ali, L.D. Assistant (Retired), Office of the Sub-Registrar, Mukalmua, resident of Vill. Loharkatha, P.O. Loharkatha, P.S Mukalmua, District: Nalbari, Assam

.....Petitioner

-Versus-

1. The State of Assam

Represented by the Commissioner & Secretary, Revenue (Registration) and Disaster Management Department, Dispur, Guwahati 781006

2. Finance Department, represented by the Principal Secretary to the Govt. of Assam, Finance Department, Dispur, Guwahati-781006

3. The Secretary, Pension and Public Grievances Department, Dispur, Guwahati-781006

4. The Inspector General of Registration, Assam
Rupnagar, Guwahati-781032

5. The District Registrar, Nalbari, District: Nalbari (Assam), PIN 781335

6. The Account General (A&E), Assam GE-10, Beltola, Guwahati-781029

.....Respondents

- B E F O R E -
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SOUMITRA SAIKIA

Advocate for the petitioner : Mr. R. Islam, Advocate

Advocate for the respondents : Mr. B. Chakravarty, SC, AG
Mr. S Dutta, SC, Revenue for R-1 & 4
Mr. R Borpujari, SC, Finance for R-2

- Date on which Judgment was reserved : 10.03.2026
- Date of Pronouncement of Judgment : **08.06.2026**
- Whether the pronouncement is of the Operative Part of the Judgment : No
- Whether the full Judgment has been pronounced : Yes

JUDGMENT AND ORDER(CAV)

The petitioner is before this court seeking a direction to the respondents to consider his services rendered for about 24 years as LDA on commission basis in the Revenue Registration Department, Government of Assam for grant of pension under the old pension scheme.

2. The brief facts pleaded by the petitioner is that the Government of Assam, Registration Department, by a notification under Memo No. REGN 42/78/29-A dated 28th February 1984, published a notification wherein it was stated that the Government of Assam in exercise of the power conferred by Section 7 of the Registration Act, 1908 was pleased to accord sanction for opening of a commission basis Sub-Registry office at Mukalmua in the then Kamrup District, having concurrent jurisdiction of the Registration offices at Nalbari, Belsor, and Hajo. By a separate Notification dated 28th April 1984, the Government of Assam, Registration Department appointed one Md. Hussain Ali as a Commission Basis Sub-Registrar of the said commission basis Sub-Registry office at Mukalmua in the

district of Kamrup. The newly appointed Commission Basis Sub-Registrar will be remunerated in accordance with the provisions contained in the Registration Manual Assam. Necessary office accommodation to be arranged by him at his own cost, books, forms etc. will be supplied to him by the Inspector General of the Registration, Assam and if necessary, the said Commission Basis Sub-Registrar may arrange for office establishment.

3. In terms of the Notification dated 28th of April 1984 and in terms of the instructions contained therein for opening a Commission Basis Sub-Registry office at Mukalmua in the then District of Kamrup, the concerned Sub-Registrar at the relevant point in time appointed the petitioner on Commission Basis as Lower Division Assistant/Head Assistant in the Commission basis Sub-Registry Office at Mukalmua with effect from the joining of the petitioner. The petitioner joined as Commission Basis Lower Division Assistant/Head Assistant in the Commission Basis Sub-Registry Office at Mukalmua on the very same day of his appointment. Subsequently, the Sub-Registrar, Mukalmua filed representation dated 14.03.1988 for conversion of the commission basis Sub-Registrar office at Mukalmua into a department under the government and on receiving the said proposal, the matter was processed. Thereafter, by notification dated 22nd June, 2007 issued by the Registration Department, Government of Assam, the department was pleased to convert 5 (five) existing commission basis Sub-Registry office into departments with effect from the date of posting of the departmental officers and subordinate staff. It was also stated that the commission system would cease to exist soon after the appointment of the departmental Sub-Registrar and Subordinate staff. In the said communication, the

name of the commission basis Sub-Registry office at Mukalmua was at Sl. No. 1 of the said list along with 4(four) other commission basis sub-Registry office.

4. Thereafter, by notification dated 25th April 2008, it was stated that in the interest of public service and also as per the cabinet decision dated 05.04.2007, Governor of Assam is pleased to regularize the service of the employees of the Mukalmua Commission basis Sub-Registry office against the posts sanctioned vide Letter No. REGN 39/2000/125 dated 25.04.2008 shown against each of the names with effect from the date of creation of the posts. The name of the petitioner appeared as Sl. No. 2 in the column containing the names of the employees and the designation. According to the petitioner, he was required to be considered for salary and seniority with effect from 31st of May 1984 after approximately 24 years of service, which are required to be considered notionally while re-fixing his pay on regularization under provisions of FR 22(1)a. The petitioner was given a minimum scale of pay of LDA at the time of conversion from commission basis to salary basis, but the scale of the petitioner should have been re-fixed as per FR 22 of the Assam Fundamental Rules by giving notional seniority to the services rendered earlier on commission basis.

5. Thereafter, the Government of Assam published the Assam Registration Service Rules, 2010 and the same came into effect from 19.11.2010 with publication in the Official Gazette. Although the said news did not give retrospective effect, however, the petitioner, having rendered 24 years of services as a commission basis LDA under the commission basis sub-registrar and he discharged his work as Head Assistant till his regularization in April 2008, his services

ought to have been considered for giving notional benefit. He subsequently demitted office on 31.01.2015. The grievance of the petitioner is that the sub-Registrar- Md. Hussain Ali, being in a similar situation having not been considered has approached this court by filing W.P(C) No. 3551/2013, whereby the claims of Md. Hussain Ali for getting the benefits was answered by a Coordinate bench. This was challenged by the State of Assam and the judgment of the Coordinate Bench came to be upheld vide judgment and order dated 12.05.2023 passed in W.A No. 73/2019.

6. The case projected before the Court on behalf of the petitioner is that the petitioner although served as Lower Division Assistant and ultimately as Head Assistant and demitted office on 31.01.2015, he had also rendered his services on commission basis sub-Registrar at Mukalmua and the coordinate bench of this court by judgment and order dated 12.05.2023 upheld the claims of the sub-Registrar- Md. Hussain Ali towards his claim for notional seniority and pay benefits, the writ petitioner being similarly situated, his claims are also required to be answered in terms of the said judgment and that not having been done, the present writ petition has been filed.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the notional seniority and arrears of salary for the petitioner ought to have been recalculated and released to him as per the mandate of FR 22. He also refers to the judgments in support of his cases, which were already referred to and relied upon in writ appeal No. 73/2019. The petitioner had submitted a detailed representation before the authorities but the said representation has been pending and no orders have been passed.

8. The learned counsel for the respondents Inspector General of Registration and the finance department has contested the case by filing their counter-affidavits as also the Department for Revenue and Disaster Management.

9. According to the Finance Department, the service of the petitioner was regularized against the post of LD Assistant, which was created and sanctioned on 25.04.2008 and therefore he was brought within the ambit of the New Defined Pension Scheme which came into effect on 01.02.2005. It is further submitted that the petitioner had contributed to the New Defined Pension Scheme and necessary deductions have also been made in this regard. The Finance Department has raised the following objections that the petitioner was appointed temporarily by the commission basis sub-Registrar and there is nothing on record to show that his appointment was ratified by the government prior to his regularization on 25.04.2008. Insofar as the sub-Registrar of Md. Hussain Ali was concerned, there was no finding recorded by the court that he had contributed to the New Defined Pension Scheme or that any deductions in that regard were made. In so far as the petitioner is concerned, he having been regularized in 2008, he would fall under the New Defined Pension Scheme brought in 01.02.2005 and he has also made his contributions, under the said scheme. Therefore, the claim in the present writ petition that he is required to be brought under the old pension rules and be governed by the Assam Services pension Rules, 1969. It is further submitted that under the Assam Registration Service Rules 2010, under Rule 13, there is a provision for appointment of a sub-registrar who had earlier served as sub-registrar on commission basis. However, there

is no provision under the said Rules to provide for regular appointment of Lower Division Assistant who had earlier served as Lower Division Assistant on commission basis and in the judgments of the Coordinate bench which was upheld by the Appellate bench of this Court, there was no finding that there is any provision under the Assam Registration Rules, 2010 which provide for regularization of Lower Division Assistant who had earlier served on Commission Basis Lower Division Assistant. It is therefore submitted that petitioner was serving on being appointed by the commission basis sub-Registrar and it cannot be termed to be an appointment to a civil post prior to his regularization in service with effect from 25.04.2008. He further submits that as per the new Rule 2A of the Assam Services Pension Rules, there is no challenge made to this Rule in the present proceeding nor was there any occasion for the Division Bench to render any finding. In terms of the said Rules, Rule 2A, it is clearly provided that the Assam Services Pension Rules, 1969, will not be applicable to any government servant appointed on or after 01.02.2005 to the services and posts in connection with the affairs of the state government of Assam and which are borne on pensionable establishment, whether temporary or permanent. Such employees will be governed by the new Defined Contribution Scheme 2009.

10. The learned counsel for the Finance Department therefore submits that the regularization of the petitioner by order dated 25.04.2008 is an order of fresh appointment, and which is evident from the fact the petitioner's post of Lower Division Assistant was created and sanctioned on 25/4/2008. It is submitted that the petitioner had ventilated his grievances before this court only after the judgment and order of Md. Husain Ali, and therefore he is a

fence-sitter and his claims ought not to be considered as prayed for. In support of his contentions, the counsel for the respondents has referred to the judgment of the Coordinate Bench of this Court rendered in Purnima Hore Vs. State of Assam and Ors¹. It is therefore submitted that the service rendered by the petitioner on commission LDA was ad hoc in nature, and therefore the said period cannot be counted for giving benefit to the Assam Services Pension Rules 1969. There being no challenge to the amendment Rules of 2A. The Assam Services Pension Rules, 1969 will not be applicable to the petitioner as he was appointed after 2005 that is after the new pension scheme was enacted.

11. The Department of Registration, Government of Assam, has also contested the matter by filing their affidavits. The learned counsel did not dispute the facts urged by the petitioner in respect of his initial date of appointment and subsequent regularization. However, it is submitted that at the time when the petitioner was appointed and as a commission basis LDA, he was appointed by the then Commission Basis Sub-Registrar without any ratification from the government. Therefore, his appointment was neither as a regular government servant, nor can it be said that he was holding a civil post. After the petitioner was regularized vide order dated 25.04.2008, petitioner submitted an undertaking before the Finance Department that he will not be governed by the Assam Services Pension Rules, 1969 and the orders issued thereunder from time to time and that his pension and other retirement benefits will be governed by the new pension Rules of 2005. The petitioner thereafter also made contributions under the new pension scheme.

¹ 2023 0 Supreme (Gau) 148

Therefore, having submitted an undertaking and made necessary contributions, he cannot now be permitted to resile from the undertaking given and claim that he required to be brought under the Assam Services Pension Rules, 1969 and given the same benefits as Md. Hussain.

12. The learned counsel for the parties have been heard. Pleadings available on record have been carefully perused.

13. There is no dispute with regard to the fact that regarding the appointment of the petitioner on a commission basis LDA, in the Mukalmua sub-Registry office, which was at that relevant point in time also run by the commission basis sub-Registrar. There is also no dispute that the petitioner was appointed by the commission basis sub-Registrar pursuant to the appointment of the Sub-Registrar vide order dated 28.04.1984. The petitioner was appointed by the office of the Sub-Registrar Mukalmua on 31st of May, 1984. Subsequently, on the proposal being routed before the Government and a cabinet decision having been undertaken on 05.04.2007, the Governor of Assam was pleased to regularize the services of the employees of the Mukalmua Commission basis sub-Registry since its conversion by notification dated 22.06.2007 against the post-sanctioned and shown against each of the names with effect from the date of creation of the posts. In the said notification, the names of all the 7 employees who were employed under the Mukalmua Sub-Registry Office, including the writ petitioner, was reflected. The name of the petitioner was at serial No. 2 and shown as an LD Assistant. The said notification, however, specifies that an undertaking as prescribed in Finance Department Circular No. BW. 3/2003/Pt-II/1 dated 25.01.2005 must be furnished by each employee to their respective

higher authorities immediately without fail. The said Notification dated 25/1/2005 prescribes for an undertaking that they shall be governed by the new pension rules. The new pension rules were brought into effect from 01.02.2005. Pursuant to the petitioner being regularized by the notification dated 25.04.2008, he continued to render his service until his date of superannuation, which was on 31.01.2015.

14. In this context, it is necessary to refer to the judgment of the Coordinate bench rendered in W.P(C) No. 3551/2013 [Md. Hussain Ali Vs State of Assam and Ors] by the judgment and order dated 22.09.2014. In the said judgment, the petitioner before the Coordinate Bench, who was the sub-Registrar, the challenge was made to consider the period of service rendered by him on commission basis for counting as qualifying service for entitlement to pension as the period that he had rendered service from 2008 till his date of superannuation, which is 31/3/2013, did not make up the qualifying service which would entitle him to pension. The Coordinate Bench examined the matter by referring to various judgments, including the judgment of the Apex Court rendered in State of Assam Vs. Kanak Ch. Dutta², where the Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court was considering the question as to whether Mouzadar appointed in the Assam Valley for collection of land revenue was a holder of civil post under the state. The Coordinate bench also relied on the judgment rendered in Dolly Borpujari vs. State of Assam³. The Coordinate bench held that the nature of work discharged by the sub-registrar is a perennial nature of work and there is a master and servant relationship between the sub-registrars working on

² AIR 1967 SC 884

³ 2010 (2) GLT 147

commission basis and the state and therefore there was no justifiable reason to exclude the work and the experience rendered by Sub-Registrar on commission basis for the purpose of computing qualifying pensionable service after he is regularized and brought into the regular cadre of Sub-Registrar and the commission paid for the earlier period of service instead of a salary would not make a material difference and rejected the contention of the respondents that Note 2(iv) (a) to Rule 44 of the Assam Services Pension Rules 1969 wherein it is provided that government servant who is not in receipt of pay but is remunerated by fees or commission would not be entitled to pension; will not be applicable in the case of the petitioner therein. The Court had referred to the earlier order dated 19.10.2012 passed by yet another Coordinate Bench in an earlier writ petition filed that although the said matter was closed by directing the Revenue and the Finance to examine the case of the petitioner in the light of the observations made that that under Rule 31 of the Pension Rules, the Governor has the power to make an exception to either or both of the conditions specified under Rule 31 for grant of pension in case of any government servant if they are not fulfilled. The Court directed the Revenue and the Finance to examine the case of the petitioner in the light of the observations made and pass a speaking order thereon and finally dispose of the matter. In the subsequent writ petition, the Coordinate bench was of the view that this direction had expressly directed the respondents to examine the case of the petitioner and had stopped short of declaring that the service services rendered by the petitioner on commission basis should be counted towards pension and the indication given was quite clear and discernible. However, the respondents had failed to examine the matter in tune with the letter and spirit of the said order

and therefore, the subsequent writ petition filed by the petitioner, the order which is pressed into service, that the services rendered by him as sub-Registrar on commission basis should be included for the purpose of computation of his pensionable services has merit and deserves consideration and the respondents were directed to count the service rendered by the petitioner as sub-Registrar on the commission basis prior to his Regularization and the writ petition was allowed without any order to cost. This came to be assailed by the State by filing Writ Appeal No. 73/2019. The Division bench of this Court upheld the judgment rendered by the Coordinate bench and dismissed the petition upholding the judgment and holding that the judgment of the Single Judge did not suffer from any infirmity which warrants interference. The relevant paragraphs of the judgment of the Writ Appeal No. 73/2019 are extracted below:

"16. Needless to say that the fact regarding the State Government having appointed the respondent as a Sub-Registrar on commission basis vide notification dated 28.04.1984 is admitted. There is no dispute that at that particular point of time, neither any service rules for Registration Department were in force nor was there any parallel cadre forpost in which the respondent rendered his services. The respondent continued to render duties as a Sub-Registrar on commission basis without a demur from 1984 till 02.04.2008. The State Government did not pay salary or any other benefits to the respondent for the services rendered by him and his remuneration was totally dependent on commission from registration fees collected. Thus, the respondent performed duties as a regularly appointed Sub-Registrar for almost 24 years without causing any direct burden to the State exchequer.

17. Considering the services rendered by the respondent and his peers in total of five Sub-Registry offices to be perennial, satisfactory and indispensable, a notification dated 22.06.2007 was issued by the State Government converting the 5 existing commission-based Sub-Registry Offices into departmental ones and the commission system was discontinued thereafter. This included Mukalmua Sub-Registry office, where the respondent was serving. The services of the

respondent were regularized on 25.04.2008. However, the rules governing the services of the respondent, i.e. Assam Registration Service Rules, 2010 came to be promulgated even much later, i.e. on 18.11.2010. The notification dated 28.04.1984 whereby, the respondent was appointed as a Sub-Registrar on commission basis, clearly indicates that he would not be allowed to take any other employment during the period of his incumbency as commission based Sub-Registrar. The nature of appointment indicated in this order was perennial and the respondent was committed to perform duties as a Sub-Registrar on full time basis and was precluded from taking any other job during the period of his engagement as a Sub-Registrar.

18. In the earlier round of litigation i.e. WP(C) No.1614/2012, the Finance Department gave its concurrence that it was ready to consider the case of the employee subject to the condition that the parent department forwarded the same. Thus, there was almost a tacit agreement of the Finance Department regarding the pension claim of the respondent. The stand now taken by the State in this appeal is clearly in divergence with the stand taken in the earlier round of litigation. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Chandra Prakash Pandey (supra) relied upon by the respondent's counsel held that Kurk Amins appointed on commission basis by different District Magistrates/Collectors within the State of U.P. for realization of outstanding dues of the various cooperative societies were Government servants holding civil posts. The view taken in the said judgment was reiterated in the case of Shakti Prasad Bhatt (supra). Almost identical controversy was examined by the Division Bench of this Court in the case of Dolly Borpujari (supra). The Division Bench accepted the claim for pension laid by the appellant therein who was appointed as a Language Officer on coterminous basis with the Assam Official Languages (Translation of Central Law) Commission. Finding that the functioning of the Commission was continuing and was expected to continue in forceable future, the Division Bench held that the service rendered by the appellant therein under the Commission was a service under the Government and thus, such tenure was considered to be constituting qualifying service for the purpose of pension. The situation of the respondent herein stands on a better footing because he was appointed as a Sub-Registrar by the State Government way back in the year 1984 to render services as such on commission basis. The services rendered by the respondent were unquestionably perennial in nature. As per the appointment order, the respondent was not entitled to take up any other employment during his tenure as a Sub-Registrar. The Office of the Sub Registry, where

the respondent was working, was departmentalized in the year 2008 and thereafter, his services were regularized. Needless to say that regularization can only be done of a person who is already in Government service.

19. A Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court in the case of State of Assam v. Kanak Ch. Dutta 5 held that a Mouzadar appointed in the Assam Valley for collection of land revenue was a holder of civil post under the State even though he received remuneration by way of commission. The said judgment was relied upon by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Chandra Prakash Pandey (supra). Thus, there is ample material on the record of the case to affirm that the respondent upon being appointed as a Sub-Registrar on commission basis w.e.f. 28.04.1984 was definitely serving against a civil post and that his past services were of a perennial nature.

20. Note 2 sub-clause (iv)(a) to Rule 44 of the Rules of 1969 on which, reliance was heavily placed by learned Government counsel, stipulates that the Government servant who is not in receipt of pay but is remunerated by fees or commission would not be entitled for pension. Manifestly, the said restriction would not come in the way of the respondent because on the date of superannuation, he was no longer receiving remuneration by way of commission but was drawing regular scale of pay after regularization of his services w.e.f. 25.04.2008. As a consequence, we are of the firm view that the regularization of services of the respondent for the purpose of counting the service for pension benefits would have effect from the date of his initial appointment vide the notification dated 28.04.1984 issued by the State Government.

21. In wake of the discussion made herein above, we are of the firm view that the learned Single Bench was absolutely justified in holding that the services rendered by the respondent for a period of almost 24 years as a Sub-Registrar on commission basis w.e.f. 28.04.1984 are required to be accounted for the purpose of computation of his pensionable service and all other consequential terminal benefits. The impugned judgment dated 22.09.2014 passed by the learned Single Bench in WP(C) No.3551/2013 does not suffer from any infirmity warranting interference.

22. Hence, the appeal preferred by the State fails and is dismissed as being devoid of merit.

23. No order as to costs."

15. Although the Respondent Department has referred to certain judgments and had attempted to persuade this court that the petitioner had already given an undertaking that he would be governed by the new pension scheme and had also made pension contributions, there was no submission made on behalf of the respondents that the judgments rendered by the Division bench in W.A No. 73/2019 has rendered a judgment which was in conflict with law laid down by the by the Apex Court or by this court. No appeal or review in respect of the Division bench Order & Judgment has been preferred, and therefore the judgment has attained finality.

16. The only issue to be decided is whether the services rendered by the petitioner for prior to his regularization in the government service are to be counted towards granting pensionary benefits and also the increments as may be payable to the petitioner by way of arrear of salaries. According to the petitioner, he is similarly situated like Md. Hussain Ali, who was the sub-registrar and whose claims were allowed by the coordinate bench and consequently upheld by the Divisional bench in W. A No. 73/2019. According to the respondents, the petitioner is not similarly situated inasmuch as Md. Hussain Ali, who was the respondent in W.A No. 73/2019, was appointed as sub-Registrar on commission basis by the government by the order dated 28.04.1984, whereas the petitioner was appointed as an LDA by the said commission basis sub-Registrar. Although there could have been a master-servant relationship between the government and Md. Hussain Ali- the commission basis Sub-Registrar, there is no such master-servant relationship between the petitioner and the government as he was never appointed by the government and his appointment by the Sub-Registrar was never

ratified. This submission of the government both the Finance and the Revenue, appears to be seriously flawed. While it is true that the government initially did not appoint the present petitioner in the manner it had appointed Hussain Ali, the fact remains that by the notification dated 25.04.2008, the Government of Assam was pleased to regularize the services of the employees of the Mukalmua Commission Basis Sub-Registry Office. By the said notification, including the sub-Registrar-Md. Hussain Ali and all the other employees, which included the present petitioner. This regularization of the services of the petitioner as ordered by the government, could not have been issued unless the appointment of the petitioner was not ratified by the government by implication. This is also the finding specifically arrived at by the Division Bench in Paragraph-21 of the judgment dated 13.05.2023 passed in W.A. No. 73/2013. If that be so that the arguments of the Finance as also the Revenue cannot be accepted that the regularization of the petitioner by order dated 25.04.2008 is to be accepted as a fresh appointment. A plain reading of the notification dated 25.04.2008 clearly reveals that this is an order of regularization and not an order of appointment. Therefore, the attempt of the respondents to persuade the court to interpret this notification as a notification which has to be construed to be the grant of issuance of a fresh appointment to the writ petitioner, therefore, rejected.

17. The benefit of the services rendered by the petitioner on commission will have to be granted to the writ petitioner as the import of the notification dated 25th of April 2008, whereby the service of the petitioner along with 6 others was regularized can only mean that the services rendered by the petitioner as a commission

basis LDA was also in effect and deemed to be ratified by the government. As correctly pointed out by the Division Bench that unless the person is/was already in government service, there was no occasion to regularize him. Under such circumstances, the claim of the petitioner for counting of his services and towards arrear salary, if any, for the period rendered will have to be accepted. The argument of the respondents that the petitioner's regularization was carried out in 2008 and that he had signed the undertaking and had also made contributions under the new pension rules, cannot debar the respondents from granting the benefit due to the petitioner in view of as the regularization being carried out by the notification dated 25th of April 2008, the petitioner having rendered service under the government since his days of initial appointment, albeit on commission basis, the respondents cannot take away the benefit of the services rendered.

18. As discussed above, since there is no further appeal against the judgment dated 12.05.2023 passed in W.A No. 73/2019 or any review, the same is binding on this court. The views expressed by the Division bench will equally apply in the case of the writ petition.

19. Under such circumstances, writ petition therefore stands allowed. The petitioner will be re-examined by the authorities and his dues claimed be calculated and granted to the petitioner within a period of three (3) months from the date of receipt of the certificate copy of this order. The petitioner will be granted his pension under the Assam Services (Pension) Rules, 1969 and the contributions made by the petitioner under the New Pension Rules be adjusted or refunded back to the petitioner.

20. In view of the discussions above, it is not necessary to refer to and discuss the judgments rendered by the respondents.

21. The writ petition stands allowed and disposed of. Pending I.A if any also stands disposed of.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant