

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Civil Appeal No(s).8642-8643/2014

RAJESH (DEAD) THROUGH LRS

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

UTTARIYA RAJASTHANI

SAHAKARI DUGDH UTPADAK SANGH LTD. &amp; ANR.

RESPONDENT(S)

Date : 10-12-2025 These appeals were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KAROL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASANNA B. VARALE

For Appellant(s) :

Mr. K. Paari Vendhan, AOR  
Mr. Rishabh Sancheti, Adv.  
Ms. Padma Priya, Adv.  
Mr. Nishant Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Aquib Ali Khan, Adv.  
Mr. Sparsh Saxena, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

Ms. Chitragda Rastravara, Adv.  
Mr. Abhijeet Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Anirudh Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Aishwary Mishra, Adv.  
Mr. Dhananjai Shekhwat, Adv.  
Ms. Sakshi Aggarwal, Adv.  
Mr. Yuvraj Singh, Adv.  
Ms. Pearl Pundir, Adv.  
Mr. Dashrath Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Gp. Capt. Karan Singh Bhati, AOR

Upon hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

1. We are of the considered view that our order dated 11.09.2025 has not been complied with by respondent no.1. There was no revision of pay scale as a consequence of the order dated 07.08.1995 passed by the Tribunal. The operative portion of the order dated 07.08.1995 reads as

**under :**

"11. That dismissal of Chowkidar Sri Rajesh S/O Sardararam being represented by Urmul Dairy Worker's Union Bikaner Division by the security officer was not legal and justified and the order for the dismissal by the respondent is liable to be set aside. It is hereby ordered that the petitioner must be paid total salary and benefits of the period between his dismissal and his reinstatement into service. A copy this decision be forwarded to the State government under section 7 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,"

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner invites our attention to the document (Annexure PA-9 of the rejoinder affidavit), wherein a person junior to the employee/original petitioner, namely Gopal Singh, who was appointed/promoted on 01.01.1996, stands granted monetary benefits with pay revision which is higher than that of the employee/original petitioner. In continuation of this chain of events, our attention is also invited to Annexure PA-11 (at page no.149), wherein the said Gopal Singh Bhati is shown to have drawn a net salary of Rs.42,443/- (Rupees Forty-Two Thousand Four Hundred Forty-Three Only) as of January 2020, whereas as per the affidavit filed by the respondents, the amount quantified in the case of the employee in question is merely between Rs.710 and Rs.710.5 (for FY 2011-2012, FY 2012-2013 and FY 2013-2014). It is wholly unclear as to how the pay of the employee/original petitioner could be fixed at such a low level when compared to his junior.

3. As such, we direct the respondent to positively comply with our order dated 11.09.2025 within one week, failing which the Chairman/Managing Director of respondent no.1 shall remain present before this Court.

4. Let an affidavit of compliance be filed within a period of two weeks.

5. List on 28.01.2026.

(D. NAVEEN)  
COURT MASTER (SH)

(ANU BHALLA)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)