

A BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD

v.

KRISHAN KUMAR VIJ & ANR.
(Civil Appeal No. 3439 of 2007)

B AUGUST 19, 2010

[DALVEER BHANDARI AND DEEPAK VERMA, JJ.]

Service Law:

C *Time-bound promotional scale – Entitlement to – Held:*
The Circular of the Authority and service Regulations provided
for time-bound promotional scale only to directly recruited
Assistant Engineers/Assistant Executive Engineers or to
D those who had acquired the requisite qualifications prescribed
for the direct recruitment – The order and the Regulations are
not applicable to promotees irrespective of their academic
qualification – Promotees cannot be treated at par with the
direct recruits as the same would amount to violation of
Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution – PSEB, Service of
E Engineers (Electrical) Regulations, 1965/PSEB, Service of
Engineers (Civil) Regulations, 1965 – Regulation 7(a)(i) r/w.
Regulation 9 – Constitution of India, 1950 – Articles 14 and
16 – Administrative Law – Public Policy.

F *Interpretation of Statutes – Purposive construction – A*
statute or an enacting provision must be so construed as to
make it effective and operative – When the words of a statute
are clear and unambiguous, the court is bound to give effect
to that meaning only which serves the cause and purpose
irrespective of the consequences – If there are two
G interpretations, the narrower one which would fail to achieve
the manifest purpose of the legislation, to be avoided.

Constitution of India, 1950:

H

**BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD v. KRISHAN 463
KUMAR VIJ & ANR.**

Articles 136 and 141 – Special Leave Petition – Dismissal of – At preliminary stage with non-speaking order – Held: Does not constitute a binding precedent – Precedent. A

Article 226- Writ petition before High Court filed belatedly – Held: Approach of High Court in condoning inordinate, long and unexplained delay in a casual manner neither proper nor legal – Delay/Laches. B

The Punjab State Electricity Board (PSEB) issued an Office Order dated 23.4.1990 giving time-bound benefit of promotional scale. According to this Circular, the benefit of first time-bound placement was to be available to an employee on completion of 9 years of regular service on the post and the second time bound promotional scale was to be available after completion of sixteen years of service. The Circular also provided that the employees who did not fulfil the qualification/passing of examination essential for promotion to the next higher post, were also to be placed into the time-bound promotional/devised promotional scale. The above order was adopted by the appellants-Board. Thereafter on 24.5.1990, PSEB issued another Order specifying the promotional scales for Assistant Engineers and the conditions precedent for eligibility thereof. The order also mentioned that the higher scales as specified in the Orders was to be available only to the directly recruited Assistant Engineers as per Regulation 7 (a) (i) r/w Regulation 9 of PSEB, Services of Engineers (Electrical) Regulations, 1965, and PSEB Services of Engineers (Civil) Regulations, 1965. C
D
E
F

Respondent No. 1 made several representations claiming grant of time-bound promotional scale, stating that having completed 16 years of service, he was entitled to the same. As the representations were not heeded to, he filed a writ petition. The High Court disposed of the G
H

A same, directing the appellant-Board to decide the representation by reasoned order. The representation was decided by the appellant-Board, against respondent No. 1. He again filed a writ petition. High Court allowed the petition and directed grant of next higher pay-scale to the respondent. Therefore, the instant appeal was filed. Other appeals were also filed which involved the same issue.

C The appellant-Board, *inter alia*, contended that respondent No. 1 did not fall in the category of stagnated employee as provided under Clause 2 of the Order dated 24.5.1990; and that the writ petition filed by respondent No. 1 was belated and liable to be dismissed on the ground of delay and laches.

D Respondent No. 1 contended that the issue in question had already been decided by the High Court in favour of a similarly situated employee, which view was further approved by the Supreme Court, by dismissing the SLP challenging the order of the Court.

E Allowing the appeals, the Court

F HELD: 1. The earlier order of the High Court and this Court passed in a previous case creates no bar from re-examining the matter on merits. Mere dismissal of a Special Leave Petition at a preliminary stage does not constitute a binding precedent and accordingly, any order passed by the High Court placing reliance on an earlier order, can still be challenged subsequently. Thus, dismissal of a matter by this Court at the threshold, with a non-speaking order, would not fall in the category of binding precedent. Therefore, the impugned order of the Division Bench of the High Court can still be challenged on merits by the appellant-Board. [Paras 20 and 21] [478-C-D; 479-B]

H

**BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD v. KRISHAN 465
KUMAR VIJ & ANR.**

Kunhayammed and Ors vs. State of Kerala amd Anr. A
2000 (6) SCC 359 – relied on.

2.1 No illegality was committed by the Board in rejecting respondent No.1's representation. The High Court has clearly erred in setting aside and quashing the same. The impugned judgment completely defeats primary purpose of the Order dated 24.5.1990 and the provisions applicable to the employees of the appellant-Board. Though the Order dated 24.5.1990 was issued only with an intention to remove the stagnation but this would not give blanket or absolute right to any employee to be entitled to higher pay scale even if he does not fulfil pre-requisite qualifications for holding the higher post. If he possesses the required qualifications but is unable to get the higher post on account of non-availability of such post, then only he can be categorised as suffering from stagnation as per Order of 23.4.1990. An employee who does not fulfil the qualification as per Regulation 10(4) for the higher post would be ineligible for promotion and/or higher pay scale. In that eventuality, such an employee cannot complain of stagnation. Moreover, even while adopting the Order dated 24.5.1990, it was made clear by the appellant-Board that the time bound promotional/ devised promotional scales after 9/16 years' service are admissible only in respect of the posts in which the initial induction is through direct recruitment. [Paras 25, 26 and 27] [481-D-H; 482-A] B
C
D
E
F

2.2 Clause 2 of Order dated 24.5.1990 r/w. Regulation 9 of PSEB, Services of Engineers (Electrical) Regulation, 1965 and PSEB, Services of Engineers (Civil) Regulations, 1965, restricts the benefit only to directly recruited Assistant Engineers/Assistant Executive Engineers, meaning thereby that one must possess the requisite qualification as prescribed under the Regulations, then only the benefit would accrue to the G
H

A employee, not otherwise. The note appended thereto
 clearly stipulates that even those employees who were
 promoted under Regulation 7(a)(ii) r/w Regulation 10(4)
 of PSEB Regulations shall be deemed to have been
 appointed by direct recruitment. This legal fiction is
 B limited. It is applicable only to those employees who have
 been promoted in conformity with the provisions
 contained in clause 4. Thus, the employees who had
 passed both parts (A) and (B) of the AMIE Examination
 and were promoted against 9% posts reserved for that
 C class were fictionally treated as direct recruits. Thus, it
 clearly stipulates that only those Assistant Engineers who
 were either directly recruited or had acquired the requisite
 qualifications prescribed for direct recruitment were
 chosen to be granted higher scale if they had been
 D promoted against the post falling within the quota of 9%
 of the cadre strength of the said post. [Para 23] [481-D-
 G]

2.3 Order dated 24.5.1990 does not apply to the
 promotees irrespective of their academic qualifications
 E nor can they be treated at par with the direct recruits.
 There was a purpose of treating them so, otherwise, it
 would have the effect of violating the constitutional
 mandate contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the
 Constitution of India, on the premise that unequals have
 F been treated as equals. It is with that intention, to avoid
 criticism and future litigation that such persons who
 possessed qualifications for direct recruitment and could
 be promoted against the posts falling vacant, would
 become entitled to claim the benefit. Since respondent
 G No.1 did not fall in this category, he was not entitled to
 the higher scale. [Para 24] [480-H; 481-A-C]

2.4 The Regulations had been notified in the year
 1965. Respondent No.1 was in service with the appellant-
 Board for two decades or so after promulgation of the
 H

**BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD v. KRISHAN 467
KUMAR VIJ & ANR.**

Regulations. All the employees claiming benefit of the Order dated 24.5.1990 retired long after the promulgation of the Regulations. Thus, they were fully aware and conscious of the fact that the relevant Regulation puts a partial embargo and impediment on their future career for promotion. They were aware that unless they are able to acquire these requisite qualifications, the benefit of the Order dated 24.5.1990 cannot be extended to them. Even though, they had enough opportunity and time to do so, but they did not improve their respective qualification. In such a fact situation, they cannot complain of stagnation. [Para 28] [482-B-D]

2.5 During the course of the hearing, the appellant-Board agreed that an employee who is able to acquire the requisite qualification and has also served the appellant-Board for the minimum required length of years as Assistant Engineer would be entitled to get the benefit, provided he fulfilled the requisite conditions. The appellant-Board has also agreed that if an employee has acquired qualifications for grant of promotion and has suffered stagnation, then he would be entitled for stepping up/revision of his pay scale. Thus, all such employees who have cleared both parts of the AMIE examination, but have not put in required experience of working as Assistant Engineer in consonance with the order dated 24.5.1990 and the Regulations, the appellant-Board would be fully justified in rejecting their claims. [Para 32] [483-F-G]

3.1 A statute or any enacting provision must be so construed as to make it effective and operative. Any such construction which reduces the statute to a futility has to be avoided. The courts will reject the construction which is likely to defeat the plain intention of the legislature even though there may be some inexactitude in the language used. If the choice is between two

- A interpretations, the narrower of which would fail to achieve the manifest purpose of the legislation should be avoided. A statute is designed to be workable and the interpretation thereof by a court should be to secure that object unless crucial omission or clear direction makes
- B that end unattainable. When the words of the statute are clear, plain or unambiguous and are reasonably susceptible to only one meaning, the courts are bound to give effect to that meaning only which serves the cause and purpose, irrespective of the consequences.
- C [Paras 36 and 38] [484-H; 485-F-G]

Murray v. IRC (1918) AC 541; *Whitney v. IRC* (1926) AC 37 – referred to.

- 3.2 In order to attain the fruitful results of the Order
- D dated 24.5.1990, a meaningful and proper construction has to be given which would achieve the object for which it was passed, rather than to give a narrower construction which may defeat the very purpose of passing the said order. No doubt, it is true that the Order dated 24.5.1990
- E is not happily worded, but even then the only inevitable conclusion that can be deciphered from the same is that the benefit thereof would accrue to only those directly recruited Assistant Engineers/Assistant Executive
- F Engineers who have pre-requisite qualification for appointment to the higher post. Obviously, if an employee does not have the required qualification, then under no circumstances he would be entitled to claim benefit of the Order dated 24.5.1990. [Para 36, 38] [484-H; 485-A; D-E]

- G *M.V. Joshi v. M.U. Shimpi* AIR 1961 SC 1494 = 1961 (3) SCR 986 – relied on.

- 3.3 The implementation of the interpretation given by the High Court to the Order dated 24.5.1990 would lead to unsustainable consequences. It would then mean that
- H every Assistant Engineer irrespective of his conduct,

**BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD v. KRISHAN 469
KUMAR VIJ & ANR.**

qualifications, performance or behaviour would become entitled to the higher scale on completion of particular length of service. If that be so, then even those employees with poor service record and doubtful integrity would also become entitled to claim higher scale merely because they had completed a particular length of service. If such an interpretation is to be given to the Order dated 24.5.1990, then it would not only be improper but would also be against public policy and interest of the appellants-Board. [Para 33] [483-H; 484-A-B]

4. The writ petition of respondent No. 1 deserved to be dismissed only on the ground of delay and laches. The employers had categorically raised the ground of delay of eight years, by the employee, in approaching the High Court. But the High Court has simply brushed it aside and condoned such an inordinate, long and unexplained delay in a casual manner. The approach of the High Court was neither proper nor legal. [Para 39] [485-H; 486-A-B]

5. All the respondents of various appeals have since demitted the office on attaining the age of superannuation. While they were in service, may be on account of orders of the High Court, to save itself from being hauled up for committing contempt of court, the appellants-Board has made payments to them towards arrears etc. After such a long lapse of time, more so, when the respondents have already retired, it will be harsh on the part of the Court to direct recovery thereof. Thus, it is directed that the amounts already paid to the respondents would not be recovered by the appellants-Board. [Para 40] [486-C-D]

Case Law Reference:

2000 (6) SCC 359	Relied on.	Para 20	
(1918) AC 541	Referred to.	Para 34	H

A (1926) AC 37 Referred to. Para 34
AIR 1961 SC 1494 Relied on. Para 37

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No. 3439 of 2007.

B From the Judgment & Order dated 06.12.2004 of the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh in Civil Writ Petition No. 19306 of 2003.

C WITH
C.A. Nos. 3438, 3418 & 3440 OF 2007.

D J.L. Gupta, D.S. Nehra, Nidhi Gupta (for S. Janani) Satinder S. Gulati, Kamaldeep Gulati, Dr. Kailash Chand for the Appellant.

E Mahaveer Singh, T.S. Doabia, Reena Singh, Sanjeev Kumar, Roshan (for T. Mahipal), Kuldip Singh (for Ajay Pal), Kiran Bhardwaj (for Sushma Suri) (for Anil Katiyar), Anil Mittal, Vibhuti Sushant, Kumud Lata Das, Rajiv Kataria, Debjani Das Purkayastha (for Delhi Law Chambers) for the Respondents.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

F DEEPAK VERMA, J. 1. This Judgment and Order shall govern disposal of C.A.No.3439 of 2007, C.A.No.3438 of 2007, C.A. No. 3418 of 2007 and C.A. No.3440 of 2007 as they project common question of law to be answered by this Court. Precisely, we are required to consider whether in the light of the Order/Circular issued by the appellant- Bhakra Beas Management Board (hereinafter shall be called as 'Board'), G respondent No.1 - employee would be entitled to the benefit of higher scale of pay/upgradation/stepping up of salary sans pre-requisite qualification for the grant of the same.

H 2. For the sake of convenience, facts appearing in Civil

**BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD v. KRISHAN 471
KUMAR VIJ & ANR. [DEEPAK VERMA, J.]**

Appeal No.3439 of 2007 are being taken into consideration. Respondent No.1, Krishan Kumar Vij had initially joined the services of the State of Punjab, Department of Irrigation as Tracer in 1949. He was thereafter promoted as a Draftsman in the year 1950. He was further promoted as Divisional Head Draftsman, some time in the year 1962. Thereafter, he was transferred in the services of the Board. There also, he earned promotion as Circle Head Draftsman and then as the Assistant Design Engineer. Regular promotion to respondent No.1 on the post of Asstt. Design Engineer in Punjab Service of Engineers (II) was granted with retrospective effect from 1.6.1976. Finally, on attaining the age of superannuation, he retired from service on 31.1.1987. Even though, respondent no.1 had earned several promotions, while in service, he still complained of stagnation in service as he was not able to earn further promotion. This was the cause for triggering off the instant litigation.

3. Brief history giving rise to this litigation is as under :-

4. State of Punjab was of the opinion that there existed stagnation amongst various cadres of regular employees. Pursuant thereto, an Office Order was issued by the Punjab State Electricity Board (for short 'PSEB') on 23.4.1990, adopted by the Board vide Order dated 26.06.1992. The aims and objects of the said Office Order issued by the PSEB are reproduced hereinbelow :

"The Punjab State Electricity Board have been seized of the problems of stagnation prevailing amongst the various cadres of regular employees and its consequent effect in their efficiency. It is felt that an employee should under ideal service conditions get normally two promotions from his initial recruitment level during his service. However, this is not always possible owing to non-availability of promotional posts. The aspiration of the employees can however, be met to a great extent, by allowing time-bound higher scales to the employees at two stages in their service career. The

A Punjab State Electricity Board has, therefore, decided to
 introduce scheme to allow time-bound benefit of
 promotional scales after the completion of 9/16 years of
 regular service in the PSEB, provided the maximum
 benefit on being placed in the time-bound promotional
 B scales does not exceed five increments including
 promotional increment(s) to the subordinate employees
 having a maximum scale upto Rs.3500/- except the
 categories where the benefit of time-bound placement to
 higher scale is applicable on the Punjab Government
 C pattern as in the case of teachers etc.”

5. The said scheme of time-bound benefit of promotional
 scale commenced from 1.1.1986 but the payment of arrears
 was spread over two years i.e. arrears from 1.1.1986 to
 28.2.1989 were to be paid in 1990-91 and 1991-1992. As per
 D this Circular, the benefit of first time-bound placement would be
 available to an employee on completion of 9 years of regular
 service on the post and second time-bound promotional scale
 would be available after completion of sixteen years of service.
 Para 7 thereof refers to those employees who do not fulfil the
 E qualification/passing of examination essential for promotion to
 the next higher post, but they shall also be placed into the time
 bound promotional/devised promotional scale to be specified
 by the Board in the schedule as referred to in para 5. It has
 been mentioned in para 5 that the Board shall draw schedules
 F indicating the lowest post(s) for direct recruitment in respect of
 various cadres for the purpose of this order, separately.

6. Pursuant to the said order, another order was issued
 by P.S.E.B. on 24.5.1990 (hereinafter for brevity shall be
 G referred to as 'Order of 1990') specifying the promotional
 scales for Assistant Engineers and the conditions precedent
 for eligibility thereof, adopted by the Board.

7. The relevant part of the said Order of 1990, is
 reproduced hereinbelow:

H

BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD v. KRISHAN 473
KUMAR VIJ & ANR. [DEEPAK VERMA, J.]

"2. The above higher scales will only be available to the *directly recruited Assistant Engineers* as per regulation. (emphasis supplied by us) A

7-A(i) read with regulation-9 of PSEB, Service of

7-A(i) read with Regulation-9 of PSEB, Service of B

Engineers(Electrical)Regulation-1965

Engineers (Civil) Regulations – 1965

The cases of Assistant Engineers appointed by promotion as per provisions of the Regulation 7-A (ii) read with Regulation – 10 of the Regulations ibid will be governed by Guidelines circulated vide Secretary Finance Officer Order No. 197/PRC/FIN-1988 dated 23.04.1990. C

Note: The departmental (Technical Subordinate and Drawing Staff) who while in service of the Board have been promoted to the post of AE(Electrical) (Civil) against quota reserved for promotion from amongst them under Regulation 7-a(ii)read with D

Regulation 7-(A)ii) read with

Regulation 10 (7) of the PSEB_____ E

Regulation 10 (4) of the PSEB_____ F

Service of Engineers (Electrical) Regulations-1965

Service of Engineers (Civil) Regulations - 1965

shall be deemed to have been appointed as Assistant Engineers like the Assistant Engineers appointed through direct appointment under G

Regulation 7 A (i) read with Regulation – 9 of the

Regulation 7-a(i) read with Regulation-9 of the H

A Service of Engineers (Electrical)

Service of Engineers (Civil)

Ibid for the purpose of grant of above next higher scales after 9/16 years of regular service as Assistant Engineer/ Assistant Executive Engineer/ Executive Engineer, prescribed period to be counted from the date of joining the post of Assistant Engineer on regular basis. Similarly, Graduates in

C Electrical/Mechanical Engineering/AMIE qualified

Civil Engineering/AMIE qualified

hands who possesses this qualification before joining the service of the Board and subsequently promoted as Assistant Engineers against quota reserved for promotion from amongst them in terms of provisions of

D

Regulation 7–a(ii) read with Regulation 10(9) of

Regulation 7–a(ii) read with Regulation 10(6) of

E Service of Engineers(Electrical) Regulations-1965

Service of Engineers (Civil) Regulations-1965

will be treated likewise. “

F Regulation 7 A has wrongly been described in the Order/ Circulars instead, it be read as Regulation 7 (a), wherever it appears.

v

G 8. Clause 2 of the aforesaid Order of 1990 categorically stipulates that it would be applicable only to directly recruited Assistant Engineers as per Regulation 7(a)(i) read with Regulation 9 of the Regulations and to none others.

9. In the case in hand, we are concerned only with Civil Engineers, directly recruited to the posts of Assistant Engineers (Civil).

H

**BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD v. KRISHAN 475
KUMAR VIJ & ANR. [DEEPAK VERMA, J.]**

10. Pursuant to the above two Orders, respondent no.1 had made several representations claiming grant of time-bound promotional scale of Rs.4500-6300 w.e.f. 1.1.1986. A

11. Since several representations made by respondent no.1 did not bring required result, he was constrained to file C.W.P. No. 6945 of 2003 in the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, which came to be disposed of on 8.5.2003, with a direction to the Board to decide the representation in the light of relevant law, rules and instructions by passing a speaking order. In the aforesaid Writ Petition, no notice was issued to the appellant-Board. In consequence of the directions passed by the High Court as mentioned hereinabove, respondent No.1's representation was considered at length by the Board but was decided against him on 22.8.2003 which was again challenged by respondent No.1 before the Division Bench of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana. The High Court vide the impugned judgment and order passed on 6.12.2004 allowed respondent No.1's Writ Petition whereby and whereunder the order dated 22.8.2003, passed by the Board was set aside with further direction to grant to the said respondent the next higher pay scale after completion of 16 years of service. It is this order which is being assailed by the Board before us. B
C
D
E

12. According to respondent No.1, since he had completed requisite length of service of 16 years on the post of Assistant Design Engineer, thus had become entitled for the higher pay scale. It appears, he took the cue for filing the 2nd Writ Petition on the strength of orders passed by the High Court in another petition filed by other employee, as mentioned hereinbelow. F

13. It is pertinent to mention here that one of such employees Rajinder Singh Patpatia had also independently filed C.W.P.No. 9162 of 1994, which was allowed on 26.8.1999 by the learned Single Judge of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana. Letters Patent Appeal No.1127 of 1999 filed by the Board, against the aforesaid judgment and order of the learned Single Judge was dismissed on 13.1.2001 by the Division G
H

A Bench of the said High Court. Challenging the order of Division
 Bench as also that of the learned Single Judge of the High Court,
 the Board had preferred Special Leave Petition No.2393 of
 2002 in this Court, which was dismissed on 15.2.2002. An
 application for review of the said order was filed by the Board
 B in this Court but was similarly dismissed and met the same fate.

14. We have heard learned Senior Counsel Shri Jawahar
 Lal Gupta, Mr. D.S. Nehra and Ms. Nidhi Gupta, Advocate for
 the appellant-Board. Shri Mahabir Singh, Ms. Reena Singh,
 C Mr.Sanjeev Kumar, Mr. Mahipal, advocates, Mr. T.S. Doabia,
 Sr. Advocate, Mr.Anil Mittal, Mr.Rajiv Kataria, advocates
 appeared for the respondents at length and perused the
 records.

15. Mr. Jawahar Lal Gupta, learned Senior Counsel
 D appearing for appellant strenuously challenged, attacked and
 hammered the impugned judgment broadly on the following
 grounds :

(i) Respondent No.1's Writ Petition could not have been
 E entertained, belatedly after a lapse of 8 years, thus was liable
 to be dismissed on the ground of delay and laches.

(ii) Respondent No.1 herein had already earned 3/4
 promotions before he attained the age of superannuation. Thus,
 his case would not fall under the category of stagnated
 F employee.

(iii) Order of 1990 has wrongly been interpreted by the
 Division Bench of the High Court.

(iv) Clause 2 of Order of 1990 clearly stipulated that the
 G same would be applicable only to directly recruited Assistant
 Engineers (Civil) and to none others. Admittedly, respondent
 No.1 does not fall in that category, consequently would not be
 entitled for it.

H (v) The Division Bench also lost sight of the fact that unless

BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD v. KRISHAN 477
KUMAR VIJ & ANR. [DEEPAK VERMA, J.]

an employee had pre-requisite qualification for promotion, the question of grant of time-bound higher pay scale or upgradation in salary, would not arise.

16. Per contra, the learned counsel for respondent no.1 contended that issue is no more *res integra* in the light of the order passed in the matter of Rajinder Singh Patpatia by learned Single Judge of the High Court, confirmed in LPA by Division Bench, further approved by this Court, by dismissing the Board's Special Leave Petition at the threshold and then rejection of review petition. It has been contended by them that stagnation would be applicable at all stages and to all the employees, who have not been granted promotion, otherwise the very purpose of the word 'stagnation' would stand defeated.

17. They have also submitted before us that there was no question of granting promotion to them but the actual relief on the strength of the order/circular which could have been granted to the employees was stepping up, upgradation/ revision of the pay scale without being actually promoted to next higher post. In other words, they have contended that no interference is called for in the impugned judgment and the appeals being devoid of merits and substance, deserve to be dismissed.

18. As mentioned herein above while granting relief to respondent no.1, Division Bench has placed reliance on the earlier Division Bench judgment rendered in the case of Rajinder Singh Patpatia, whereby and whereunder the Board's Writ Appeal was dismissed and the order dated 26.8.1999 passed by Learned Single Judge was confirmed. Special Leave Petition (C) No. 2393 of 2002 was dismissed on 15.2.2002 and a Review Petition filed by the Board also came to be dismissed by this Court. They have thus contended that the same reliefs ought to have been granted to respondent no.1 also as he was similarly situated and the High Court committed no error in doing so.

19. Thus, we are required to first consider this aspect of

A the matter, where earlier Special Leave Petition and Review
having been dismissed at the preliminary stage by this Court,
what would be its effect on the impugned judgment. Whether
the same can still be assailed and challenged even though,
earlier view of the High Court in identical matter has a seal of
B approval of this Court.

20. However, this issue should not detain us any longer in
view of well considered judgment of a three-Judge Bench of
this Court reported in 2000(6) SCC 359 titled *Kunhayammed*
& Ors Vs. State of Kerala & Anr. wherein this Court
C categorically held that mere dismissal of a Special Leave
Petition at a preliminary stage does not constitute a binding
precedent, and accordingly, any order passed by the High
Court placing reliance on earlier order, can still be challenged
subsequently.

D 21. The relevant para of the aforesaid judgment in
Kunhayammed (supra) authored by most illustrious learned
Judge (Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.C. Lahoti as he then was) in his
lucid and concise language has held as under: (at page 377):

E "27. A petition for leave to appeal to this Court may be
dismissed by a non-speaking order or by a speaking
order. Whatever be the phraseology employed in the order
of dismissal, if it is a non-speaking order, i.e., it does not
F assign reasons for dismissing the special leave petition,
it would neither attract the doctrine of merger so as to
stand substituted in place of the order put in issue before
it nor would it be a declaration of law by the Supreme
Court under Article 141 of the Constitution for there is no
law which has been declared. If the order of dismissal be
G supported by reasons then also the doctrine of merger
would not be attracted because the jurisdiction exercised
was not an appellate jurisdiction but merely a discretionary
jurisdiction refusing to grant leave to appeal. We have
already dealt with this aspect earlier. Still the reasons

H

BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD v. KRISHAN 479
KUMAR VIJ & ANR. [DEEPAK VERMA, J.]

stated by the Court would attract applicability of Article 141 of the Constitution if there is a law declared by the Supreme Court which obviously would be binding on all the courts and tribunals in India and certainly the parties thereto. The statement contained in the order other than on points of law would be binding on the parties and the court or tribunal, whose order was under challenge on the principle of judicial discipline, this Court being the Apex Court of the country. No court or tribunal or parties would have the liberty of taking or canvassing any view contrary to the one expressed by this Court. The order of Supreme Court would mean that it has declared the law and in that light the case was considered not fit for grant of leave. The declaration of law will be governed by Article 141 but still, the case not being one where leave was granted, the doctrine of merger does not apply. The Court sometimes leaves the question of law open. Or it sometimes briefly lays down the principle, may be, contrary to the one laid down by the High Court and yet would dismiss the special leave petition. The reasons given are intended for purposes of Article 141. This is so done because in the event of merely dismissing the special leave petition, it is likely that an argument could be advanced in the High Court that the Supreme Court has to be understood as not to have differed in law with the High Court."

It was further held in para 40 reproduced hereinbelow :

(page 382) "40. In any case, the dismissal would remain a dismissal by a non-speaking order where no reasons have been assigned and no law has been declared by the Supreme Court. The dismissal is not of the appeal but of the special leave petition. Even if the merits have been gone into, they are the merits of the special leave petition only. In our opinion neither doctrine of merger nor Article 141 of the Constitution is attracted to such an order."

A Thus, according to the law laid down by the Bench of three
 learned Judges of this Court, it is clear that dismissal of a
 matter by this Court at the threshold, with non-speaking order,
 would not fall in the category of binding precedent. Meaning
 thereby that the impugned order of the Division Bench can still
 B be challenged on merits by the Appellant Board. Thus, the
 earlier order of the High Court and this Court passed in Rajinder
 Singh Patpatia's case, creates no bar from re-examining the
 matter on merits.

C 22. We have already mentioned hereinabove with regard
 to Clause 2 of Order of 1990 read with Regulation 9 which
 restricts the benefit only to directly recruited Assistant Engineers/
 Assistant Executive Engineers, meaning thereby that one must
 possess the requisite qualification as prescribed under the
 Regulations, then only the benefit would accrue to the
 D employee, not otherwise.

E 23. The note appended thereto clearly stipulates that even
 those employees who were promoted under Regulation 7(a)(ii)
 read with Regulation 10(4) shall be deemed to have been
 appointed by direct recruitment. This legal fiction is limited. It
 is applicable only to those employees who have been promoted
 in conformity with the provisions contained in clause 4. Thus,
 the employees who had passed both parts (A) and (B) of the
 AMIE Examination and were promoted against 9% posts
 F reserved for that class were fictionally treated as direct recruits.
 Thus, it clearly stipulates that only those Assistant Engineers
 who were either directly recruited or had acquired the requisite
 qualifications prescribed for direct recruitment were chosen to
 be granted higher scale if they had been promoted against the
 post falling within the quota of 9% of the cadre strength of the
 G said post.

H 24. Order of 1990 contemplates that it is to be followed
 as per Regulation which provides that only such persons as
 have been promoted under Regulation 7(a)(ii) read with
 Regulation 10(4) shall be treated as direct recruits. In other

**BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD v. KRISHAN 481
KUMAR VIJ & ANR. [DEEPAK VERMA, J.]**

words, it does not apply to the promotees irrespective of their academic qualifications nor they can be treated at par with the direct recruits. There was a purpose of treating them so, otherwise, it would have the effect of violating the constitutional mandate contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India, on the premise that unequals have been treated as equals. It is with that intention, to avoid criticism and future litigation that such persons who possessed qualifications for direct recruitment and could be promoted against the posts falling vacant, would become entitled to claim the benefit. Since respondent no.1 did not fall in this category, obviously, he was not entitled to the higher scale.

25. Thus, there appears to be no illegality committed by the Board in rejecting respondent no.1's representation. So, in our considered opinion, the High Court has clearly erred in setting aside and quashing the same. Critical examination of the impugned judgment passed by the Division Bench of the High Court completely defeats primary purpose of the Order of 1990 and provisions applicable to the employees of the Board. No doubt, it is true that the Order of 1990 was issued only with an intention to remove the stagnation but this would not give blanket or absolute right to any employee to be entitled to higher pay scale even if he does not fulfil pre-requisite qualifications for holding the higher post. In other words, if he possesses the required qualifications but is unable to get the higher post on account of non-availability of such post, then only he can be categorised as suffering from stagnation as per Order of 23.4.1990.

26. Obviously, an employee who does not fulfil the qualification as per Regulation 10(4) for the higher post would be ineligible for promotion and/or higher pay scale. In that eventuality, such an employee cannot complain of stagnation.

27. Moreover, even while adopting the Order of 1990, it was made clear by the Board vide its Order dated 26.6.1992 that the time bound promotional/devised promotional scales

A after 9/16 years' service are admissible only in respect of the posts in which the initial induction is through direct recruitment.

B 28. It is pertinent to mention here that the Regulations had been notified in the year 1965. Respondent no.1 was in service with the Board for two decades or so after promulgation of the Regulations. All the employees claiming benefit of the Order of 1990 had retired long after the promulgation of the Regulations. Thus, they were fully aware and conscious of the fact that the relevant Regulation puts a partial embargo and impediment on their future career for promotion. They were aware that unless they are able to acquire these requisite qualifications, the benefit of the Order of 1990 cannot be extended to them. Even though, they had enough opportunity and time to do so, but they did not improve their respective qualification. In such a fact situation, they cannot complain of stagnation. They have to thank their own stars that despite having knowledge of the provisions of the Regulations applicable to them, they did not make any attempt to acquire the qualifications.

E 29. It is also to be noted that even though respondent no.1 was junior to Rajinder Singh Patpatia who was granted relief by the High Court, still respondent No.1 took such a long time to approach the High Court. The aforesaid legal and factual aspect of the matter specially the interpretation of the order of 1990 read with the Regulations was not properly and reasonably appreciated by the Division Bench. In this regard, it is necessary to quote the stand of the appellant-Board right from the very beginning when it had proceeded to reject the representation of respondent no.1.

G 30. The relevant portion of the reason of the Board so assigned to reject the respondent's representation is reproduced hereinbelow :

H "in view of the principles/features enunciated in the scheme for grant of time-bound placement into the promotional/

**BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD v. KRISHAN 483
KUMAR VIJ & ANR. [DEEPAK VERMA, J.]**

devised promotional scale after 9/16 years of regular service as introduced on the PSEB pattern, the case of Diploma Holder SDOs does not fall within the ambit of grant of 1st and 2nd Time-bound Promotional Scale after completion of 9/16 years regular service as admissible to the directly recruited Degree Holder AEs and departmental employees (Technical Subordinate and Drawings Staff) who have been promoted on the basis of the AMIE/Degree in Engineering against their share quota on the PSEB pattern.”

The aforesaid reasoning of the Board entirely rests on the Order of 1990 and the Regulations applicable to such employees.

31. During the course of the hearing, a question was posed to the learned counsel for the appellant Board:- if an employee is able to acquire the requisite qualification and has also served the Board for the minimum required length of years as Assistant Engineer whether such an employee would be entitled to get the benefit of the order of 1990 or not.

32. Mr. J.L Gupta, learned senior counsel appearing for the Board categorically submitted that such employees would be entitled to get the benefit provided, they fulfilled the requisite conditions. Learned counsel for the appellant has agreed that if an employee has acquired qualifications for grant of promotion and has suffered stagnation, then he would be entitled for stepping up/revision of his pay scale. Meaning thereby that all such employees who have cleared both parts of the AMIE examination, but have not put in required experience of working as Assistant Engineer in consonance with the order of 1990 and the Regulations, the Board would be fully justified in rejecting their claims.

33. If the interpretation of the High Court to the Order of 1990 is to be implemented, then it would lead to unsustainable consequences. It would then mean that every Assistant

- A Engineer irrespective of his conduct, qualifications, performance or behaviour would become entitled to the higher scale on completion of particular length of service. If that be so, then even those employees with poor service record and doubtful integrity would also become entitled to claim higher
- B scale merely because they had completed a particular length of service. If such an interpretation is to be given to the Order of 1990, then it would not only be improper but would also be against public policy and interest of the Board. It is too well settled that a statute or any enacting provision must be so
- C construed as to make it effective and operative. Any such construction which reduces the statute to a futility has to be avoided.

34. It has been stated by Lord Dunedin, in the case of *Murray v. IRC* (1918) AC 541 at p. 553 that, 'it is our duty to
- D make what we can of statutes, knowing that they are meant to be operative and not inept and nothing short of impossibility should in my judgment allow a judge to declare a statute unworkable'. The principle was reiterated by him in a later judgment in the case of *Whitney v. IRC* (1926) AC 37 at p.52,
- E where he observed, 'a statute is designed to be workable and the interpretation thereof by a court should be to secure that object unless crucial omission or clear direction makes that end unattainable.

35. The aforesaid observations make it abundantly clear
- F that the courts will, therefore, reject the construction which is likely to defeat the plain intention of the legislature even though there may be some inexactitude in the language used. If the choice is between two interpretations, the narrower of which would fail to achieve the manifest purpose of the legislation
- G should be avoided.

36. In view of this, to attain the fruitful results of the Order of 1990 we have to give it a meaningful and proper construction which would achieve the object for which it was passed, rather
- H than to give a narrower construction which may defeat the very

BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD v. KRISHAN 485
KUMAR VIJ & ANR. [DEEPAK VERMA, J.]

purpose of passing the said order.

A

37. In somewhat similar circumstances, a Bench of two learned Judges of this Court in the case of *M.V. Joshi v. M.U. Shimpi* AIR 1961 SC 1494 = 1961 (3) SCR 986 eloquently said as under :

B

“... But these rules do not in any way affect the fundamental principles of interpretation, namely, that the primary test is – the language employed in the Act and when the words are clear and plain the court is bound to accept the expressed intention of the legislature.”

C

At the cost of repetition, we reiterate that the clear and plain reading of the Order of 1990 is as has been interpreted by us hereinabove.

38. No doubt, it is true that the Order of 1990 is not happily worded, but even then the only inevitable conclusion that can be deciphered from the same is that the benefit thereof would accrue to only those directly recruited Assistant Engineers/ Assistant Executive Engineers who have pre-requisite qualification for appointment to the higher post. Obviously, if an employee does not have the required qualification, then under what circumstances he would be entitled to claim benefit of the Order of 1990. A statute is designed to be workable and the interpretation thereof by a court should be to secure that object unless crucial omission or clear direction makes that end unattainable. In our considered opinion, the Order of 1990 cannot be logically interpreted in any other manner than what we have done. It is also too well settled that when the words of the statute are clear, plain or unambiguous and are reasonably susceptible to only one meaning, the courts are bound to give effect to that meaning only which serves the cause and purpose irrespective of the consequences.

D

E

F

G

39. Yet, another question that draws our attention is with regard to delay and laches. In fact, respondent no.1's petition deserved to be dismissed only on that ground but surprisingly

H

A the High Court overlooked that aspect of the matter and dealt with it in a rather casual and cursory manner. The appellant had categorically raised the ground of delay of over eight years in approaching the High Court for grant of the said relief. But the High Court has simply brushed it aside and condoned such an
 B inordinate, long and unexplained delay in a casual manner. Since, we have decided the matter on merits, thus it is not proper to make avoidable observations, except to say that the approach of the High Court was neither proper nor legal.

C 40. It is not in dispute that all the respondents of various appeals have since demitted the office on attaining the age of superannuation. While they were in service, may be on account of orders of the High Court, to save itself from being hauled up for committing contempt of court, Board has made payments to them towards arrears etc. After such a long lapse of time,
 D more so, when the respondents have already retired, it will be harsh on our part to direct recovery thereof. Thus, we direct that the amounts already paid to the respondents would not be recovered by the Board.

E 41. At the cost of repetition, we may reiterate that the effect of the Order of 1990 read with the Regulations would be that only those employees who fulfilled the pre-requisite qualification for further promotion along with certain length of service as required would only be entitled to the benefit as per the Order of 1990. The other Assistant Engineers, even though they had
 F completed the requisite length of service would not be entitled to claim the benefit, unless they had fulfilled the basic qualifications and minimum experience as required.

G 42. In the facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the considered opinion that the impugned order cannot be sustained. It has to be set aside and quashed and we accordingly do so. The appeals are accordingly allowed as indicated hereinabove. The parties to bear their costs.

H K.K.T Appeals allowed.