

[2023 LiveLaw \(SC\) 273](#)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
INHERENT JURISDICTION

DR. DHANANJAYA Y. CHANDRACHUD; CJI., KRISHNA MURARI; J., HIMA KOHLI; J.
April 05, 2023.

Review Petition (Civil) No. 510 of 2023 (D No 34780 of 2022) in Writ Petition (Civil) No 643 of 2015

Union of India versus All India Judges Association

Judicial Service - Supreme Court dismisses petitions filed by Union of India and some states to review the order for implementation of the enhanced pay scale for judicial officers as per the recommendation of the Second National Judicial Pay Commission (SNJPC) - Argument that uniform Index of Rationalisation (IoR) would equate the district courts with constitutional courts is erroneous; all Judges across the hierarchy of courts discharge the same essential function - The standards of ethics and professionalism expected of judges are more rigorous than those applied to other services / professions. Ensuring adequate emoluments, pension and proper working conditions for the members of the district judiciary has an important bearing on the efficiency of judicial administration and the effective discharge of the unique role assigned to the judiciary. (Para 14, 15)

WITH Review Petition (Civil) No of 2023 (D No 40671 of 2022) in Writ Petition (Civil) No 643 of 2015
Review Petition (Civil) No of 2023 (D No 440 of 2023) in Writ Petition (Civil) No 643 of 2015
Review Petition (Civil) No of 2023 (D No 3186 of 2023) in Writ Petition (Civil) No 643 of 2015

ORDER

Abbreviations

- Second National Judicial Pay Commission - SNJPC
 - First National Judicial Pay Commission - FNJPC
 - Seventh Central Pay Commission - VIIth CPC
 - Index of Rationalisation - IoR
1. Delay condoned.
 2. Applications for listing the review petitions in open Court are rejected.
 3. By its order dated 27 July 2022 in “**All India Judges Association v. Union of India**”, this Court held as follows:

“15. One of the main objections to the revision of pay structure as proposed by SNJPC, is the application of the multiplier of 2.81 and above. But this objection has already been taken by some of the States and is liable to be rejected for the two reasons, namely, (i) that the 7th Central Pay Commission has applied a multiplier of 2.81 in respect of certain categories of All India Service Officers; and (ii) that Justice Padmanabhan Committee actually applied a multiplier of 3.07.

16. As a matter of fact, SNJPC, before making its recommendations, considered three modules, i.e., (1) Master Pay Scale Method; (2) Pay Matrix Method; and (3) Fixed Pay Method. After examining the advantages and disadvantages of all the three modules, the SNJPC has adopted Pay Matrix Method, as it had already been adopted by the 7th Central Pay Commission. A fourth module, namely, Fixed Pay Pattern was also examined but was not accepted, as it was a new concept and had not been tested anywhere else.

17. Having considered the Report of the SNJPC, the objections of the Union and the State Governments and the submissions of the learned amicus, we are of the view that the revision of

¹ W.P. (C) No. 643/2015

pay structure as recommended by SNJPC, indicated in table-1 appended, hereto shall be accepted.”

4. Review has been sought of the above directions on the ground that the objections raised by the Union of India in its reply filed in W.P. (C) No. 643 of 2015 in respect of the applicability of the recommendations of the SNJPC were not duly considered by the court. The objections of the Union of India are extracted below:

“[Para 5(i)] “The rationale for this progressive IOR through the hierarchy has been explained by the 7th CPC in para 5.1.19 of its Report. The commission has clearly pointed out that the rationalization has been achieved by applying “Index of Rationalization” from PB2 onwards on the premise that with enhancement of levels from PB 1 to 2 to 3 and onward, the role, responsibility and accountability increases at each step in the hierarchy. The commission has mentioned that the proposed pay structure reflects the same principle and, hence, the existing entry pay at each level corresponding to successive grade pay has been enhanced by an “Index of Rationalization”.

However, this fundamental principle of enhanced responsibility and increased accountability with each progressively higher post and pay level has not been followed by the SNJPC. Instead, it has adopted uniformed IOR of 2.81 for all the levels in the hierarchy of the Judicial Officers which incidentally happens to be highest IOR as per 7th CPC. Therefore, this non application of progressively higher IOR to different levels does not stand the test of logic because the nature of responsibilities discharged by Judicial Officers across the hierarchy cannot be construed to be the same. Moreover, the IOR of 2.81 which has been recommended is applicable to an officer of the level of secretary to GOI. It is pertinent to add here that no judicial officer was drawing pay in an equivalent pay scale of secretary to GOI. Further, drawing an analogy from IOR of the 2.81 as allowed in a case of High Court Judges is also not tenable because, firstly, the scale of a judge of a High Court is a fixed scale and is not a span-based scale and, most importantly, duties and responsibility of the judicial officers are no match to the onerous responsibility discharged by High Court Judges.

Therefore, the pay matrix based on the uniform multiplication factor of 2.81 for all three levels as recommended by the SNJPC needs to be rationalized and graded. It is suggested that the pay matrix based on IOR of 2.67 and 2.72 may be worked out on the scientific principle followed by the 7th Pay Commission.”

5. Besides the Union of India, the States of Haryana, Manipur and Uttar Pradesh have sought a review of the order dated 27 July 2022.

6. The grounds on which the Review Petition has been filed are tabulated below:

Grounds

Raised by

A. The SNJPC report did not take into account the principle of **Union of India and the rationalization** which was required to be achieved by applying an **States of Manipur & “IoR”**. From PB1 to 2 to 3 and onwards, the role, responsibility and **Haryana** accountability increases at each step in the hierarchy. In this background, the 7th CPC had recommended successive grade pays on the basis of progressive IoR.

B. The fundamental principle of enhanced responsibility and **Union of India and the increased accountability** with progressively higher posts and pay **States of Manipur & levels** has not been considered. As a result, uniform IoR of 2.81 for **Haryana** all levels in the hierarchy of judicial officers has been adopted. This is an incorrect position adopted by the SNJPC.

C. The SNJPC has disregarded the relevance of hierarchy and **Union of India and the States of Manipur & Haryana** applied a multiplier of 2.81 for judicial officers, even though the same multiplier applies to judges of Supreme Court and High Courts. The VIIth CPC adopted it while making recommendations for the All India Services based on a progressive IoR.

D. If the order is not reviewed, it would amount to equating the higher **State of Manipur** district judiciary with constitutional courts and would bring district courts at par with the higher judiciary. Such a consequence should be avoided, as it would create an anomaly.

E. The SNJPC recommendations draw an analogy from the IoR of **Union of India and the States of Manipur & Haryana** 2.81 allowed in the case of High Court judges. This ignores the fact that the scale of a High Court judge is a fixed scale and not a span-based scale and that the duties and responsibilities of the judicial officers at a lower level are not comparable with the onerous responsibility discharged by High Court judges. Had the aspect of rationalization and progressive upgradation been considered by the Court, the appropriate pay matrix based on IOR of 2.67 and 2.72 could have been worked out.

F. Pay parity for judicial officers across the country is not correct as **States of Manipur & Haryana** the nature of responsibilities discharged by them across the district courts in the entire country and pendency of cases before them are not the same.

G. According to the Shetty Commission's recommendations, initial **State of Haryana** pay of Civil Judges was fixed at 12.5% higher than that of the IAS officers but now under the recommendations of the SNJPC, it will almost be double of the IAS officers.

H. There is already a provision of an additional increment for **State of Haryana** judicial officers in the State on acquiring a higher educational qualification of an LLM degree.

I. There will be a substantial burden on the State exchequer. Besides **State of Haryana** this, other service cadre officers in the same pay band/structure will also claim parity. This would result in unnecessary litigation.

J. The order dated 27 July 2022 is not a decision on the objection to **Union of India and the States of Manipur & Haryana** the SNJPC made by the Review Petitioner and other stake holders. It merely borrows the rationale of unrelated or not fully related analysis undertaken by other authorities, which could not have substituted a decision by this Court.

K. The order of this Court has serious legal and constitutional **State of U.P.** implications as the authority to determine the terms and conditions of judicial officers vests in the government according to Articles 233 to 235.

L. This Court has held in its order dated 28 July 2020 that the court **State of U.P.** should not be compelled to intervene in respect of pay scales and conditions of service of the district judiciary.

M. Though historically this Court has intervened in implementing the **State of U.P.** recommendations of FNJPC, JPC and SNJPC, the implementation of the recommendations has serious financial and administrative implications.

N. Implementation of the recommendations will increase the salary **State of U.P.** of judicial officers disproportionately and will compel the State Governments and the Union government to face such demands in future for applying the same multiplier for revising the salary of State and Central government employees.

O. The multiplier of 2.57 applied by VIIth CPC for revising the existing **State of U.P.** pay of Central government employees in Pay Matrix Level has not been considered and the multiplier of 2.81 suggested by SNJPC has been accepted. The referral Pay Matrix by this Court is only in fixed Pay Method Module at Pay Matrix Levels 17 and 18 that has a multiplier of 2.81 but this multiplier can never be applicable to any Master Pay Scale of Pay Matrix Level.

P. The recommendation of SNJPC with regard to the applicability of **State of U.P.** a multiplier of 2.81 for revising the pay of judicial officers in VIIth CPC Scales is erroneous as it merely relies upon erroneous norms evolved by the JPC which had recommended that the rate of increase of pay of judicial officer w.e.f. 1 January 2006 shall be in the same proportion as the High Court Judges' pay which incidentally was 3.07 times of revising it into VIth CPC scales w.e.f. 1 January 2006.

Q. The pay of the judges of the High Court has always been of the **State of U.P.** Fixed Pay Method Module whereas the pay of judicial officers has always been that of Master Pay Scale Method Module and therefore devising common formulae for revising the pay of two different modules is erroneous.

R. As per the FNJPC, a 'head start' of four increments in the initial **State of U.P.** salary of the lowest level of judicial officers was allowed over the initial salary of the lowest level of IAS officers and the salary of such judicial officers was to increase only about 12%. However, due to applicability of a wrong multiplier in the recommendations of the JPC and SNJPC this difference has increased to 10 increments in terms of increments and about 32% in terms of percentage and is going to increase further by about 40% in terms of percentage of VIIth CPC scales.

S. The increase conceived by FNJPC if continued properly, could **State of U.P.** have only resulted in prescribing the lowest stage of the pay scales of the lowest level of judicial officers to Rs.63100/- whereas because of current recommendation this is going to be Rs.77,840/in VIIth CPC scales.

T. The FNJPC had adopted the same formulae for the revision of pay as applicable to the Central government employees w.e.f. 1 January 1996 which was recommended by the Vth CPC. The FNJPC added only one modification of allowing 50% fitment weightage to judicial officers as compared to 40% allowed by the Central Pay Commission to the Central Government employees so that judicial officers already in service prior to 1 January 1996 could also be benefitted to addition to new recruits to judicial service. **State of U.P.**

We will consider whether any review is warranted on the basis of the above submissions.

7. The multiplier of 2.81 signifies the ratio on the basis of which the salary of the judges of the district judiciary would be increased. This multiplier has been adopted by taking into account all the factors governing the conditions of service of judicial officers as well as their roles and responsibilities. The SNJPC considered the multiplier of 2.81 commensurate with the increase of salary of High Court Judges to maintain the ratio of Mean Pay Percentage.

8. The SNJPC ensured that the Mean Pay Percentages spelt out by the FNJPC, keeping in view the then existing pay of High Court Judges at Rs.26,000/- remained intact. The said percentages were 45.3% for Civil Judge (Junior Division); 58.5% for Civil Judge (Senior Division); 71.6% for District Judge (Entry Level); 80% for District Judge (Selection Grade); and 91.7% for District Judge (Super Time Scale) of the salary of a High Court judge. In this context, FNJPC laid down in para 15.50 of its report that:

“In case the salary of High Court Judges is revised upwards at any time, the pay scales of Judicial Officers in all these cadres have to be suitably revised upwards by **maintaining the said ratios.**”

The SNJPC drew up a Master Pay Scale by adopting the multiplier of 2.81 and maintaining the same ratios. The rationale is succinctly explained in para 12.2 of 2nd NJPC Report which is extracted below:

“12.2 The first and foremost principle to be kept in view is the extent of rise in the salary of High Court Judge w.e.f. 01.01.2016 i.e., after the report of VII CPC which fixed the pay of Secretary to Government of India at Rs.2,25,000/-. As was done in the past, the same fixed pay has been adopted for the High court Judges. The extent of increase in relation to the previous pay was 2.81 times (Rs.80,000/- to Rs.2,25,000/-). Earlier, the increase was 3.07 times (Rs.26,000/- to Rs.80,000/-) w.e.f. 01.01.2006. JPC took this as the basis for evolving Master Pay Scale. For instance, the starting pay of Civil Judge (Jr. Div.) as per the FNJPC was Rs.9,000/-. The same was multiplied by 3.07 and the revised starting pay was arrived at as Rs.27700/-. The index 3.07 represents the extent of pay rise of High Court Judges from 01.01.2006. The increments were also multiplied by 3.07. It resulted in substantial increase in the pay of Civil Judges (Jr. & Sr. Div.). The JPC had ensured that the Mean Pay Percentages spelt out by FNJPC keeping in view the then existing pay of High Court Judges at Rs.26,000/- remained intact. The said percentages were 45.3% for Civil Judge (Jr. Div.), 58.5% for Civil Judge (Sr. Div.), 71.6% for District Judge (Entry Level), 80% for District Judge (SG) and 91.7% for District Judge (STS) of the salary of High Court Judge. As noted earlier, FNJPC laid down in para 15.50 that –

“In case the salary of High Court Judges is revised upwards at any time, the pay scales of Judicial Officers in all these cadres have to be suitably revised upwards by **maintaining the said ratios.**”

The ratios were 45.3%, 58.5%, 71.6%, 80% and 91.7% - (not to speak of ACP percentages).”

Thus the salary of the District Judge will not be at par or above the salary of the High Court Judge, at any time.

9. The SNJPC has adopted the multiplier of 2.81 uniformly for all cadres of the district judiciary except J-6 and J-7, for which the multiplier works out to 2.82 and 2.83², which is inevitable, in order to harmonize the transition from the Master Pay Scale system to the Pay Matrix system and to ensure that the comparative pay across services is not affected. When compared to the VIIth CPC, the Commission has adopted less number of stages, having regard to the different features of the judicial service/structure. The highest factor/multiplier in the VIIth CPC Pay Matrix of 2.81 is adopted uniformly for all the cadres, keeping in view the established principle that the pay increase of the district judiciary shall, as far as possible, be commensurate with the extent of increase in the pay of the judges of the High Court. FN-2 in the SNJPC report clearly brings out the rationale and is extracted below:

“When compared to VII CPC, this Commission has adopted less number of stages having regard to the different features of judicial service/structure. The highest factor/multiplier in the VII CPC Pay Matrix i.e., 2.81 is adopted uniformly for all the cadres, keeping in view the established principle that the pay increase of Subordinate Judiciary shall be, as far as possible, commensurate with the extent of increase of High Court Judges’ pay.”

10. The VIIth CPC had adopted a graduated fitment factor ranging from 2.57 for entry level officers to 2.81 for officers of the level of Secretary to the Government of India. **The SNJPC has chosen to uniformly apply the multiplier of 2.81** (the highest multiplier in the VIIth CPC matrix) as opposed to 2.72 (the next lower factor) with an intent to balance the legitimate expectations of the members of the judiciary. While a multiplier of 2.72 would reduce the disparity between the pay of IAS officers and the judiciary by 3-4% for each cadre, it would also push the number of stages in the Pay Matrix to 47, since the pay scale of the highest level judicial officer cannot be less than Rs. 2,24,100. In this context, para 13.2 of the SNJPC Report reads as follows:

“In drawing the above pay matrix, the Commission is primarily guided by the established principle that the extent of increase of pay shall be commensurate with the quantum of increase of High Court Judges’ pay which is 2.81 times the previous salary. The Commission is of the considered view that this principle rests on a rational basis. The application of a multiplicand lesser than 2.81, say 2.72 (the next lower factor in VII CPC pay matrix) would no doubt reduce the disparity between the pay of IAS and judiciary by 3% to 4% in each cadre but, on balancing of various aspects and keeping in view the legitimate expectations of the members of Subordinate Judiciary, the Commission is not inclined to disturb the formula adopted by the JPC except as regards the Mean pay percentages. In fact, if a pay matrix is to be drawn up by applying the 2.72 factor, we have to go upto 47 stages in order to reach the figure – Rs.2,24,100/- which the District Judge (STS) shall legitimately get as discussed earlier. Such pay structure going upto 47 stages is not a viable alternative.”

11. The broad principles which underlie the IoR adopted by the SNJPC have been explained in para 11.7 of the SNJPC Report. Para 11.7 is extracted below:

“11.7 In light of the above discussion and having due regard to the pay structure evolved by earlier Commissions, this Commission is of the view that the new pay structure should address the issues discussed above and **broadly** rest on the following principles:

i. The rate of increase of pay shall be in the same proportion as the High Court Judges’ pay (effective from 01.01.2016) which is 2.81 times more than the earlier pay. Incidentally, the same norm was applied by JPC while evolving the new Master Pay Scale. This will ensure adequate remuneration at all levels of Subordinate judiciary.

² Recommendation 44.4, Vol I, SNJPC Report

ii. The rate of increment shall be at 3% every year and its addition to pay shall be worked out on cumulative basis on the lines of VII CPC Pay Matrix.

iii. The maximum pay of District Judges in higher grades should be appropriately revised to avoid the anomaly that occurred earlier. The maximum pay of District Judge (STS) shall therefore be equal to the maximum pay of Higher Administrative grade of I.A.S.

iv. Due recognition shall be accorded to the principle that the emoluments of the judiciary can be higher than the administrative executive of comparable rank, though the relativities (between the pay scales of other civil servants and Judicial officers) shall be one of the relevant factors that needs to be kept in view.

v. In the matter of determination of pay scale of District Judge, the District Judge shall be equated to the Super Time Scale IAS officer. Though this observation was made by the Supreme Court in AIJA 2002, ultimately the placement of District Judge at a level between Selection grade and Super Time Scale of IAS was approved by Hon'ble Supreme Court on taking an overall view. As per the Pay Matrix to be recommended by this Commission, the pay of District Judge (Entry level) should be more than the pay of IAS officer in Super Time Scale. The overall pay scale must at any rate remain between level 13 (Selection Grade of IAS) and level 14 (Super Time Scale of IAS). The District Judge's (Entry Level) pay scale should fall within 13-A of VII CPC Pay Matrix."

12. The extent of the increase in pay of judicial officers must be commensurate with the quantum of increase in the pay of High Court judges. This principle has been enunciated by the FNJPC which has noted that an upward revision of the pay scales of High Court judges and judicial officers must be in the same ratio³. The FNJPC stated in its report that:

"We further recommend that in case the salary of the High Court Judges is revised upward at any time, the pay scales of the Judicial officers in all the aforesaid cadres, should also be suitably revised upward by maintaining the said respective ratios"⁴.

This principle was endorsed by this Court without any modification in **All India Judges Association v Union of India**⁵.

13. The Padmanabhan Commission too adopted the same principle and fixed an IoR of 3.07 in line with the upward revision of the pay of High Court judges by 3.07 times⁶, as noted in the order dated 28 April 2009 in **All India Judges' Association (III) v. Union of India**⁷. This recommendation is in line with the decision of this Hon'ble Court in **All India Judges Association v. Union of India**⁸.

14. In view of the above discussion, the issue is whether there is any compelling need to reduce the quantum of increase proposed by applying a lower multiplier so as to marginally reduce the gap between entry level IAS officers (in Junior and Senior time scales) and Judicial Officers at the first two levels (Civil Judge, Junior and Senior Divisions). Such an exercise is not warranted for more than one reason. Firstly, the initial starting pay must be such as to offer an incentive to talented youngsters to join judicial service. Secondly, the application of a multiplier/ factor less than 2.81 would result in a deviation from the principle adopted by SNJPC that the extent of increase of pay of judicial officers must be commensurate with the increase in the pay of High Court judges. This principle has been accepted by this Court by approving the recommendations of the

³ Para 4.8 read with Para 2.15, SNJPC Report, Vol I (Chapter 2)

⁴ Para 15.50 of FNJPC report. Keeping in conformity with this observation, the Padmanabhan commission adopted an index of rationalisation of 3.07 in line with the upward revision of the pay of High Court judges by 3.07 times (Para 4.8 read with Para 2.15)

⁵ (2002) 4 SCC 247 (Para 9 and 37 of the SNJPC Report)

⁶ Para 4.13, SNJPC Report, Vol I

⁷ (2011) 12 SCC 677 (Para 2 and 3)

⁸ (2010) 14 SCC 720 (Para 6)

SNJPC. Therefore, there is no valid reason to depart from the principle applied by JPC that the pay of judicial officers should be higher when compared to All India Service Officers of the corresponding rank. This principle has been approved by this Court in AIJA (2002)⁹. Thirdly, in **All India Judges Association (II) v. Union of India**¹⁰, this court rejected the comparison of service conditions of the judiciary with that of the administrative executive:

“7. It is not necessary to repeat here what has been stated in the judgment under review while dealing with the same contentions raised there. We cannot however, help observing that the failure to realize the distinction between the judicial service and the other services is at the bottom of the hostility displayed by the review petitioners to the directions given in the judgment. The judicial service is not service in the sense of ‘employment’. The Judges are not employees. As members of the judiciary, they exercise the sovereign judicial power of the State. They are holders of public offices in the same way as the members of the council of ministers and the members of the legislature. When it is said that in a democracy such as ours, the executive, the legislature and the judiciary constitute the three pillars of the State, what is intended to be conveyed is that the three essential functions of the State are entrusted to the three organs of the State and each one of them in turn represents the authority of the State. However, those who exercise the State power are the Ministers, the Legislators and the Judges, and not the members of their staff who implement or assist in implementing their decisions. The council of ministers or the political executive is different from the secretarial staff or the administrative executive which carries out the decisions of the political executive. Similarly, the Legislators are different from the legislative staff. So also the Judges from the judicial staff. The parity is between the political executive, the Legislators and the Judges and not between the Judges and the administrative executive. In some democracies like the USA, members of some State judiciaries are elected as much as the members of the legislature and the heads of the State. **The Judges, at whatever level they may be, represent the State and its authority unlike the administrative executive or the members of the other services. The members of the other services, therefore, cannot be placed on a par with the members of the judiciary, either constitutionally or functionally.**”

(emphasis supplied)

Fourthly, the argument that an uniform IoR would equate the district courts with constitutional courts is erroneous. A uniform multiplier is used for a uniform *increment* in pay and not for the purpose of uniform pay in itself. All Judges across the hierarchy of courts discharge the same essential function of adjudicating disputes impartially and independently. Thus, it would not be appropriate to apply graded IoR when SNJPC has chosen to uniformly apply the multiplier.

15. The District Courts and courts forming a part of the district judiciary discharge a prominent role in preserving the rule of law. Public confidence in the judicial system sustains the credibility of the judiciary. The district judiciary has a significant role in generating and fostering public confidence. The standards of ethics and professionalism expected of judges are more rigorous than those applied to other services/professions. Ensuring adequate emoluments, pension and proper working conditions for the members of the district judiciary has an important bearing on the efficiency of judicial administration and the effective discharge of the unique role assigned to the judiciary¹¹.

16. The legitimacy of the principle that the increase of pay of the judicial officers must be commensurate with the quantum of increase in the pay of High Court judges has been raised previously and stands judicially settled. Therefore, any objection to the IoR on the

⁹ Para 20.7 of 2nd NJPC Report

¹⁰ (1993) 4 SCC 288

¹¹ (Para 1.1 of the 2nd NJPC)

ground that it has to be lower than that adopted for increase in the pay of the judges of the High Court is without cogent basis.

17. Central government officers have had the benefit of VIIth CPC scales since 2016. Judicial officers are still awaiting a revision despite the lapse of over seven years. Lost time impinges on the nature of their working conditions and ultimately on the quality of life itself. Any reduction in the multiplier will be without principled justification.

18. SNJPC has already calculated the additional financial expenditure that would be incurred by the application of the uniform IoR. The financial implications according to the SNJP report¹² are as follows:

| Financial Implication for | Average Pay Method (Amount in Crores) | Mean Pay Method (Amount in Crores) |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| Civil Judge (Entry Level) | 85.68 | 94.27 |
| Civil Judge (Jr. Div.) ACP-I/Middle Level | 30.55 | 32.14 |
| Civil Judge (Jr. Div.) ACP-II/Senior Level | 1.86 | 1.96 |
| Civil Judge (Sr. Div.) (Entry Level) | 79.59 | 83.69 |
| Civil Judge (Sr. Div.) ACP-I/Middle Level | 14.62 | 19.40 |
| Civil Judge (Sr. Div.) ACP-II/Senior Level | 1.16 | 1.36 |
| District Judge (Entry Level) | 109.96 | 129.45 |
| District Judge (Selection Grade/Middle Level) | 26.38 | 30.88 |
| District Judge (Super-time Scale)/ Senior Level | 14.74 | 14.85 |
| Total | 364.51 | 408.00 |

19. The directions of this court applying a uniform multiplier and the corresponding financial implications cannot be considered as excessive in view of the information extracted above. In **All India Judges Association v. Union of India (II)**¹³, this court has earlier held that additional financial burden cannot be a ground for review:

“**16.** The contention with regard to the financial burden likely to be imposed by the directions in question, is equally misconceived. Firstly, the courts do from time to time hand down decisions which have financial implications and the Government is obligated to loosen its purse recurrently pursuant to such decisions. Secondly, when the duties are obligatory, no grievance can be heard that they cast financial burden. Thirdly, compared to the other plan and non-plan expenditure, we find that the financial burden caused on account of the said directions is negligible. We should have thought that such plea was not raised to resist the discharge of the mandatory duties. The contention that the resources of all the States are not uniform has also to be rejected for the same reasons. The directions prescribe the minimum necessary service conditions and facilities for the proper administration of justice. We believe that the quality of justice administered and the caliber of the persons appointed to administer it are not of different grades in different States. Such contentions are ill-suited to the issues involved in the present case.”

20. As the SNJPC has extensively and holistically dealt with the issue of the multiplier and this has been considered by the Court, there is no error apparent on the face of the record. We have furnished reasons for affirming the directions.

21. The Review Petitions are dismissed.

¹² Paragraphs 37.4 to 37.8 in pages 161 to 162.

¹³ (1993) 4 SCC 288