

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3112/2026

Bhikh Singh S/o Shri Uttam Singh, Aged About 72 Years, R/o
Harsol Ki Haveli, Gau Ghat, Fateh Sagar, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Union Of India, Through General Manager, Head Quarter
Office, North West Railway, Malviya Nagar, Near Jawahar
Circle, Jaipur.
2. Divisional Railway Manager, Jodhpur Division, North West
Railway, Jodhpur.
3. Divisional Engineer, Tail Lighting Office, North West
Railway, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Himanshu Shrimali
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Piyush Joshi for Mr. Abhishek Sharma

**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP SHAH**

Order

13/04/2026

1. The instant writ petition has been filed by the petitioner against the order dated 31.01.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Jodhpur Bench, Jodhpur, whereby the Original Application filed by the petitioner seeking grant of ACP after 12 years and MACP after 30 years of service has been dismissed.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner made a limited submission that the petitioner is entitled to ACP as he had completed the requisite tenure for the same. He further submitted that although the MACP/ACP scheme came into force in the year 1999, the

petitioner became eligible for his first MACP on the basis of his past services rendered since 1990, which ought to have been granted. He also contended that the period of service from 1972 to 1978 ought to be included while computing his eligibility.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that though the MACP scheme was introduced in 1999, the period for counting eligibility under the said scheme commenced from 24.04.1995, as the petitioner had been granted a promotion on that date.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record, this Court finds that in the limited spectrum of submissions made, the finding arrived at by the learned Tribunal that due to the promotion granted to the petitioner on 25.04.1995, the past applicability of MACP/ACP would not be available, does not suffer from any infirmity. The order of the learned Tribunal is in accordance with law, inasmuch as there is nothing on record to demonstrate that the petitioner was covered under any scheme prior to his promotion on 25.04.1995.

5. In view of the above, no interference is called for in the order passed by the learned Tribunal.

6. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed. All pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SANDEEP SHAH),J

(DR.PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI),J