

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH: BANGALORE**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.170/01801/2018

DATED THIS THE 31st DAY OF JANUARY, 2020

HON'BLE DR.K.B.SURESH, JUDICIAL MEMBER

HON'BLE SHRI C.V.SANKAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

A.L.Tandi
Aged 58 years
S/o. Langarao Tandi
Stenographer, office of the
Supdt. of Post Offices
Chikkamagaluru Division
Chikkamagaluru-577101.
Residing at 'Sree Krupa' Vidyanagar
Kadur-577548
Chikkamagaluru Dist.Applicant

(By Advocate Sri B.Venkateshan)

Vs.

1. The Union of India
Reptd by the Secretary
Department of Posts
DAK Bhavan
New Delhi-110001.
2. The Chief Postmaster General
Karnataka Circle
Bangalore-560001.
3. The Post Master General
S.K.Region
GPO Complex
Bangalore-560001.
4. The Superintendent of Post Offices
Chikkamagaluru Division
Chikkamagaluru-577101.Respondents

(By Advocate Sri K.Gajendra Vasu, Sr.CGSC)

O R D E R
(PER HON'BLE SHRI C.V.SANKAR, MEMBER (ADMN))

The facts of the case are that the applicant joined the post of Postal Assistant(PA) on 8.11.1982 at Tiptur HO under Tumakuru Postal Division. He passed the Stenographer examination and was appointed as Stenographer on regular basis w.e.f. 18.7.1991. On completion of 12 years of service in the basic grade of PA, the applicant was granted 1st financial upgradation under ACP scheme in the pay scale of Rs.5000-150-8000 w.e.f. 31.7.2003 vide CPMG memo dtd.14.8.2003(Annexure-A1). Consequent upon the introduction of MACP Scheme, the applicant was placed in 2nd MACP on completion of 20 years of service in the basic grade of PA w.e.f. 1.9.2008 with Grade Pay of Rs.4600 in PB-2 vide CPMG memo dtd.21.5.2010(Annexure-A2). Further, on completion of 30 years of service in the basic grade of PA, he was placed in the 3rd MACP w.e.f. 21.11.2012 with Grade Pay of Rs.4800 in PB-2 vide CPMG memo dtd.23.5/3.6.2013(Annexure-A3). The PMG, SK Region, Bangalore vide memo dtd.2.8.2018(Annexure-A4) without issuing any show cause notice or advance intimation, has modified the date of placement of the applicant in 2nd MACP from 1.9.2008 to 31.7.2011 on the ground that the said benefit was given erroneously and withdrawn the 3rd MACP benefit granted to him from 21.12.2012 stating that he was not eligible for the said benefit as he has not completed 30 years of service in the stenographer grade as per the clarification issued by the DOPT OM dtd.10.2.2000 which states that the officials who were appointed as stenographer through LDCE(Limited Departmental Competitive Examination) would be considered for grant of MACP benefits reckoning the date of entry into the stenographer grade only and not from the entry grade of PA and the difference of pay and allowances paid to the applicant is ordered to be

recovered. Then the applicant submitted representation on 9.8.2018(Annexure-A6) requesting to reconsider his case and cancel the orders at Annexure-A4. The Postmaster, Chikkamagaluru HO vide his letter dtd.21.8.2018(Annexure-A7) has informed the applicant that as per RO letter dtd.2.8.2018, the excess paid pay and allowances for the period from 1.9.2008 to 31.7.2018 works out to Rs.1,60,079/- and the same will be recovered from his salary in monthly instalments of Rs.8004/- from August, 2018. Then the applicant submitted a letter dtd.27.8.2018(Annexure-A8) requesting the Postmaster not to resort to recover the amount sought to be recovered till the disposal of his representation dtd.9.8.2018 submitted to the RO. Despite that the Postmaster had started recovering the alleged excess paid amount since August, 2018. The RO has rejected his case vide letter dtd.12.9.2018(Annexure-A9). The applicant submitted appeal to the CPMG on 17.9.2018(Annexure-A10) against the rejection of his case by the RO which is still pending before the CPMG.

2. The applicant submits that the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *State of Punjab & others vs. Rafiq Masih in Civil Appeal No.11527/2014* decided on 18.12.2014 held that the recoveries in five categories of cases referred therein is impermissible in law. In pursuance of the said judgment, the DOPT in OM dtd.2.3.2016(Annexure-A11) issued instructions to all Ministries and Departments advising to deal with the cases of wrongful excess payment made to the Govt. servants. In spite of the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court, the respondents of various departments particularly the Dept. of Posts have withdrawn the MACP benefits granted to the concerned employees and ordered recovery of alleged excess payments. Aggrieved by such withdrawal of benefits, some of the officials have approached various Benches of the Tribunal and got such impugned orders

set aside and quashed. This Tribunal in OA.No.361/2014 decided on 9.10.2015(Annexure-A12) held that the appointment of the applicant therein to the post of Postal Assistant based on his passing the LGO examination by his own efforts cannot be considered as promotion. Therefore, the applicant would be entitled to the 2nd MACP benefit as was initially granted to him. When the respondent filed WP.No.200807/2016, the Hon'ble High Court had dismissed the same on the ground of devoid of merits(Annexure-A13). Then the respondents filed RA which is still pending disposal before the High Court. In the meanwhile, the respondents have implemented the order of this Tribunal vide memo dtd.2.3.2018(Annexure-A14). The Madras Bench of this Tribunal in a similar case in OA.No.1088/2011 decided on 14.3.2013(Annexure-A15) held similar view as held in OA.361/2014. When the respondents filed appeal in WP.No.30629/2014, the Hon'ble High Court of Madras dismissed the same upholding the order of the CAT Madras(Annexure-A16). Thereafter, the respondents have filed appeal before the Hon'ble Apex Court in SLP No.4848/2016 which was dismissed by the Apex Court on the ground that they see no reason to interfere in the case(Annexure-A17). Thereafter, the respondents have filed RA.No.1939/2019 before the Hon'ble Apex Court which also stands dismissed on merits on 13.9.2017(Annexure-A18). Thereafter, the respondents have implemented the orders of the CAT, Madras Bench vide memo dtd.22.3.2017(Annexure-A19). Similarly Jodhpur Bench of this Tribunal in OAs.No.382/2010 & others decided on 22.5.2012(Annexure-A20) held similar view as held in OA.No.361/2014. When the respondents filed WP.No.11336/2012 before the High Court of Rajasthan at Jodhpur, the same is dismissed by the High Court on 10.8.2015(Annexure-A21).

The SLP No.23260/2018 filed against the above judgment was also stands dismissed by the Hon'ble Apex Court on 10.8.2018(Annexure-A22).

3. The applicant further submits that the applicant entered into service as Postal Assistant. He passed the Stenographer LDCE by his own efforts and was appointed on 18.7.1991 as Stenographer. This cannot be construed as automatic promotion and therefore, this appointment shall not be offset against any financial benefits as per the decisions of the various Tribunals and respective High Courts and Apex Court. As per the MACP scheme which is introduced by the DG Posts w.e.f. 1.9.2008 in supersession of previous ACP, TBOP and BCR schemes, it is applicable to all regularly appointed Group A, B & C central Govt. Civilian employees to grant three financial upgradations at intervals of 10, 20 & 30 years of continuous regular service(Annexure-A5). The applicant was placed in the 1st ACP w.e.f. 31.7.2003 which has to be offset against 1st MACP. Thereafter, after completion of 20 & 30 years of service in the basic cadre of PA, he was placed in 2nd MACP w.e.f. 1.9.2008 and 3rd MACP w.e.f. 21.11.2012 respectively which is as per rules and judicial decisions on the subject. As per the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *Rafiq Masih*, excess payment made to the employees relates earlier to 5 years shall not be recovered. Accordingly, in the instant case, the action of the respondents in resorting to recover the alleged excess payment made which relates to beyond 5 years is violative of the above decisions and untenable in law. Therefore, the applicant filed the present OA seeking the following relief:

i. Call for the records pertaining to this case from the respondents, peruse them and set aside the Memo No.5/AC/PAY/Dlgs., dated 21.8.2018, at annexure-A7 issued by the Postmaster, Chikkamagaluru HO and letter No.B24/2/Dlgs, dated 12.9.2018, at annexure-A9, issued by the Supdt. Of Post Offices, Chikkamagaluru, by which, without giving

any show cause notice or intimation, modifying the date of grant of MACP-II and the MACP-III benefit already granted was withdrawn which action adversely affects the financial aspect of the applicant.

ii. Direct the respondents to restore the date of placement in MACP-II benefit and MACP-III benefits already granted vide Annexures A2 and A3 with all consequential benefits including the refund of the alleged excess pay and allowances being recovered from the month of August-2018, in the interest of justice and equity.

iii. Pass such orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal deems fit and expedient in the facts and circumstances of the case, including the cost of this OA, in the interest of justice.

4. Per contra, the respondents in their reply statement have submitted that the applicant was appointed as Postal Assistant(PA) on 8.11.1982 at Tiptur Head Post Office under Tumakuru Postal Division. He was promoted as Grade III Stenographer through Limited Departmental Competitive Examination(LDCE) on 18.7.1991. Thereafter, he was given ACP benefit on 31.7.2003 on completion of 12 years of service taking his date of entry as Stenographer as the crucial date. Thereafter, he was granted 2nd MACP w.e.f. 1.9.2008 taking date of entry in PA cadre in which he had completed 20 years of service. Subsequently, he was granted 3rd MACP on completion of 30 years of qualifying service taking the entry as PA. When one Smt.Vijayashree R Shekar, Steno in the 2nd respondent's office who was senior to the applicant submitted representation to the 2nd respondent to consider fixation of her pay on par with her junior(applicant), it was noticed by the Circle Internal Financial Advisor while disposing the representation that the applicant will be eligible for grant of financial upgradation under MACPs reckoning from the date of entry into steno cadre only. Accordingly, 2nd respondent vide letter dtd.8.9.2017(Annexure-R1) issued instructions to the 3rd respondent to carry out review DPC to relook into the 2nd & 3rd MACPs granted to the applicant. Accordingly, vide memo dtd.12.12.2017(Annexure-R2), the 3rd respondent constituted the Departmental Review Screening Committee(DSC)

which met on 16.2.2018(Annexure-R3). Subsequently, Sr.Accounts Officer, O/o PMG, SK Region, Bengaluru was included as 4th member of the committee as per 3rd respondent's letter dtd.2.3.2018(Annexure-R4). The newly constituted review DSC met on 16.5.2018 and vide its minutes dtd.16.5.2018(Annexure-R5) examined the case with reference to the clarification issued vide DOPT OM dtd.10.2.2000(Annexure-R6) that officials who are appointed as Stenographers through LDCE are to be considered for MACP reckoning the date of entry into stenographer as direct recruitment. Accordingly, it recommended withdrawal of 2nd & 3rd MACP which were granted erroneously on 1.9.2008 & 21.11.2012 respectively to the applicant. It also recommended grant of 2nd MACP to the applicant w.e.f. 31.7.2011. Accordingly, 3rd respondent vide memo dtd.2.8.2018 issued modification to the MACP benefit granted to the applicant(Annexure-R7) and remarked that the applicant will be eligible for 3rd MACP after he completes 30 years of service in the cadre of Stenographer. Recovery was ordered in the said Memo for the difference of pay and allowances paid to the official on consequence of modified orders. Accordingly, the Postmaster, Chikkamagaluru HO after making necessary calculations, informed the applicant regarding excess paid pay and allowances for the period from 1.9.2008 to 31.7.2018 as per the modified orders which worked out for Rs.160079/- and recovery was initiated at the rate of Rs.8004/- per month from the salary of the applicant w.e.f. August-2018 till his date of his retirement i.e. 31.03.2020. Aggrieved by this action, the applicant submitted a representation to the 3rd respondent on 9.8.2018 and the same was disposed of with the remark that the DSC has reviewed the MACP benefit as per the extant rules and hence there is no scope for relook of the case and restoration of benefits beyond the recommendations of the Screening

Committee. Again the applicant submitted another representation on 17.9.2018 which was also disposed of by the 2nd respondent on 29.11.2018 stating that for the purpose of financial upgradation under ACP scheme, service has been counted from the date of entry into Steno cadre and for the purpose of financial upgradation under MACP scheme, the service has been counted from the date of entry into department as PA and this is irregular and it clearly states that the applicant is not eligible for the 2nd & 3rd MACP from the dates which are already granted to him. The action taken by the respondents was in accordance with law and there is no malafide intention in the modification of the date of MACP upgradations.

5. The respondents submit that the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *State of Punjab Vs. Rafiq Masih* is not applicable to the applicant as he belongs to Group B category and not Group C & D category as per DOPT OM dtd.17.4.2009(Annexure-R8) & 18.6.2014(Annexure-R9) according to which the officials drawing Grade Pay of Rs.4200 & 4600 and above are belong to Group B cadre. The applicant is drawing the Grade Pay of Rs.4200 and as such recovery of excess paid pay from the applicant is justified and relief sought by the applicant is not tenable. The judgment in OA.No.361/2014 & batch of this Tribunal is a case specific and cannot be generalized. When the MACP was wrongly given taking the crucial date as of date of entry into PA instead of date of entry into stenographer cadre, the error was not informed by the applicant to the employer. The respondents have relied on the judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Civil Appeal No.3500/2006* and the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in *WP.No.57935/2017*(Annexure-R10) in support of their contentions. Therefore, there is no merit in the OA and the same is liable to be dismissed.

6. The applicant has filed rejoinder reiterating the submission already made in the OA and submits that the pay scales of PA and Stenographer cadres as per the 4th CPC before 1.1.1996 were 3200-4595 & 4000-6000 respectively. These two scales were merged into one scale at Rs.4000-6000 w.e.f. 1.1.1996 as per 5th CPC. Therefore, though the PA and Stenographers are two different cadres, but their pay scale is one and the same. In view of this position, the officials of PA cadre passing the LDCE is only for a change in the cadre without any financial benefits. Therefore this change in the cadre cannot be construed as a promotion. Since the DOPT OM dtd.10.2.2000 relating to the ACP Scheme, TBOP & BCR schemes and their subsequent orders in pursuant to the said schemes stands superseded on the introduction of the MACP Scheme w.e.f. 1.9.2008, the provisions of the ACP OM dtd.10.2.2000 cannot be applied to his case concerning MACP scheme after 1.9.2008. Hence, the MACP-II & MACP-III benefits already granted has been in order. Stepping up of pay at par with the pay of the applicant sought for by the other official is unreasonable as per para-20 of the MACP rulings dtd.19.5.2009 which prescribes that 'financial upgradation under MACPs shall be purely personal to the employee and shall have no relevance to his seniority position. As such there shall be no additional financial upgradation for the senior employee on the ground that the junior employee in the grade has got higher pay/grade pay under MACPS'. Therefore, entertaining such representations and considering such cases referring to DPC/DSC etc. is of no relevance to the case. Further the reckoning of date of regular continuous service for grant of ACP and MACP benefits would be one and the same as there cannot be two different dates of entry in to Government service of the applicant. Hence, granting of ACP benefit from 31.3.2003 is not

correct. Instead he should have been granted TBOP after completion of 16 years of service i.e. 8.11.1998. Since the applicant is not aware of the provisions of ACP rules at that point of time, he could not agitate this matter then. However, he is not pressing for consideration of this aspect now. Further the applicant is only a Group-C employee as the rate of contribution towards Group Insurance Scheme for Group-C employee is Rs.30/- which is being recovered from the applicant's salary till date whereas it is Rs.60/- for gazetted Group-B officers. Further, no Govt. order treating the Stenographers with Grade Pay of Rs.4200 as Group-B gazetted appears to have been issued in this matter. Therefore, the recovery of alleged excess paid pay and allowances being made from the salary of the applicant is violative of the Hon'ble Apex Court judgment in *Rafiq Masih's* case. Hence, no recovery shall be made from the applicant's pay and the amount already recovered shall have to be refunded to him. However, this Tribunal vide order dtd.28.11.2018 has granted interim stay for the recovery and therefore no recovery is being made thereafter.

7. The respondents have filed additional reply stating that the applicant was placed in ACP grade w.e.f. 31.7.2003 on completion of 12 years of service taking his date of entry as Stenographer as the crucial date i.e. 18.7.1991 and not the date of his entry to the cadre of Postal Assistant on 8.11.1982. The applicant did not challenge the method of counting his date of entry to the cadre of Stenographer while granting upgradation under ACP scheme and accepted the same on 31.7.2003. Had the applicant wanted to count his date of entry into the cadre of PA as the crucial date of upgradation under ACP, he should have challenged the upgradation given to him on 31.7.2003. It is true that MACP was introduced in replacement of earlier ACP scheme. However, the upgradations already given

under ACP scheme were not withdrawn on introduction of MACP scheme. As such the date of entry into stenographer as direct recruitment holds good for determining the entry grade of the applicant as per the DOPT OM dtd.10.2.2000. MACP instructions did not determine the direct entry grade of the applicant. As such the modification issued to the date of MACP-II and withdrawal of MACP-III is in order. The applicant himself admits at para-3 of rejoinder that the officials of PA cadre passing the LDCE results in change in cadre. Since there is change in cadre of the applicant on passing the LDCE exam, the continuous regular service for reckoning grant of MACP was counted from the date of promotion. In regard to recovery of excess amount, the Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal No.3500/2006 held that 'the principle enunciated in *Rafiq Masih*'s case cannot apply to a situation such as in the present case, the officer to whom the payment was made in the first instance was clearly placed on notice that any payment found to have been made in excess would be required to be refunded. The officer furnished an undertaking while opting for the revised pay scale. He is bound by the undertaking'. The applicant in this case also has furnished an undertaking stating that 'any excess payment that may be found to have been made as a result of incorrect fixation of pay or any excess payment detected in the light of discrepancies noticed subsequently will be refunded by me to the Govt. either by adjustment against future payments due to me or otherwise'(Annexure-AR1). As such recovery of excess paid from his pay is justified. However, recovery has been stopped in this case in view of interim order of this Tribunal. The averment that he is not a gazetted Group B officer is not correct since the respondents did not say that the applicant is a gazetted Group B officer. He is only Group B officer. There are two categories of Group B

employees viz. Gazetted Group B and non-gazetted Group B. The applicant belongs to non Gazetted Group B. The averment of the applicant that he is not aware of the rulings on the ACP is not acceptable since he was working as stenographer to the divisional head who deals with such rulings on day to day activities and 'ignorantia juris non excusat' rightly applicable to him and he cannot claim shelter with plea of ignorance.

8. We have heard the Learned Counsel for both the parties and perused the materials placed on record in detail. The case of the applicant is that he was appointed as Postal Assistant(PA) on 8.11.1982 and he got promoted as Stenographer through a Limited Departmental Competitive Examination w.e.f. 18.7.1991. The 1st ACP was given to him w.e.f. 31.7.2003 on completion of 12 years after his appointment as Stenographer. He was further given 2nd MACP w.e.f. 1.9.2008 and 3rd MACP w.e.f. 21.11.2012 taking his service from the date of entry as PA. Finding out that this is wrong, the respondents vide Annexure-A4 have revised the 2nd MACP to be effective from 31.7.2011 i.e. 20 years from the date of appointment as Stenographer and they have withdrawn the 3rd MACP since the applicant has not completed 30 years from 1991. They have relied upon the DoPT OM dtd.10.2.2000 wherein the officials who are appointed as Stenographers through LDCE are to be considered for ACP taking note of the date of entry into Stenographer as direct recruitment. The applicant would claim that these instructions of DoPT of 2000 cannot be cited for denying him the MACP benefit which flowed from the year 2008. He also claims that his service in to the Postal Assistant was effective from 1982 and therefore he was perfectly eligible for the MACP benefits which were given in 2008 and 2012. He would contend that as per the Hon'ble Apex Court judgment in the *Rafiq Masih(White*

Washer)'s case, the recovery should not have been ordered since the orders for MACP-II & III were in operation from more than 5 years. In a number of related judgments, this Tribunal as well as the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka have accepted the contention that persons who are promoted in the department through a Limited Departmental Competitive Examination can be considered to have got one promotion within the department for the purpose of ACP/MACP. Even though such appointments may be considered as direct recruitment and since the persons have been in the service of the organisation itself, it has been consistently held that such entry into a higher post through an LDCE will have to be considered as promotion and not as a direct recruitment as only departmental employees are eligible for such appointments through an LDCE. Following that logic, the applicant having got one promotion will be eligible for two further upgradations only. He got the ACP benefit w.e.f. 31.7.2003 and he also got 2nd MACP from 2008 which was later modified to 2011. Therefore, he is clearly not eligible for the 3rd MACP even though the respondents would say that the official will be eligible for 3rd MACP after he completes 30 years of service in the cadre of Stenographer which can be given in the year 2021. Apparently, the applicant would retire on 31.3.2020. Therefore, this statement about his eligibility for 3rd MACP after completion of 30 years of service itself is not valid since he will not be eligible at all as he got one promotion and two upgradations. As rightly contended by the respondents, when the applicant got the ACP after 12 years from his promotion as Stenographer through LDCE, he did not raise any objection relating to the considering of his service as PA as apparently vide DoPT OM dtd.10.2.2000, his past service would not have been considered. However, we have to hold that as per the orders of the Hon'ble Apex Court in

White Washer's case, the recoveries ordered vide Annexure-A4 cannot be made from the applicant since he has been given upgradations in 2008 and 2012 for no fault of his. However, withdrawal of 3rd MACP cannot be considered as illegal as we have already seen that the applicant is not eligible for the 3rd MACP. However, since certain amounts have already been recovered from the applicant, those need not be returned to him as he was not eligible for the 3rd MACP. But the balance amount that was sought to be recovered shall not be recovered from the applicant in view of the Hon'ble Apex Court judgment in *Rafiq Masih(White Washer)*'s case.

9. The OA is disposed of as above. No costs.

(C.V.SANKAR)
MEMBER (A)

(DR.K.B.SURESH)
MEMBER (J)

/ps/

Annexures referred by the applicant in OA.No.170/01801/2018

Annexure-A1: CPMG Lr.No.STA/2-3/175/ACP dt.14.8.2003

Annexure-A2: CPMG Lr.No.STA/4-3/MACPS/Stno/2010, dated 21.5.2010

Annexure-A3: CPMG Lr.No.STA/4-3/MACPS/Steno dt.3.6.2013

Annexure-A4: PMG SK Lr.No.SK/STA/4-3/MACP/Steno dtd.2.8.2018
Annexure-A5: DG Posts OM No.4-7/(MACPS)/2009-PCC dtd.18.9.2009
Annexure-A6: Applicant's representation dtd.9.8.2018
Annexure-A7: Postmaster, CKM-HO, Lr.No.S/AC/Pay/Dlgs, dtd.21.8.2018
Annexure-A8: Applicant's representation dtd.27.8.2018
Annexure-A9: SPOs CKM Lr.No.B24/2/Dlgs, dtd.12.9.2018
Annexure-A10: Applicant's representation dtd.17.9.2018
Annexure-A11: DOPT OM No.18/03/2015-Estt(Pay-I) dtd.2.3.2016
Annexure-A12: Order dtd.9.10.2015 in OA.No.361/2014
Annexure-A13: Judgment dtd.20.9.2016 in WP.No.200807/2016
Annexure-A14: SSPOs Lr.No.KLB/LC/HC/29/2016 dtd.2.3.2018
Annexure-A15: Order dtd.14.3.2013 in OA No.1088/2011
Annexure-A16: Judgment dtd.4.2.2015 in WP No.30629/2014
Annexure-A17: Judgment dtd.16.8.2016 in SLP No.4848/2016
Annexure-A18: Judgment dtd.13.9.2017 in RA No.1939/2017 in SLP No.4848/2016
Annexure-A19: Memo No.B2/MACP-III/Dlgs/2016, dtd.22.3.2017
Annexure-A20: Order dtd.22.5.2012 in OA No.382/2011
Annexure-A21: Judgment dtd.10.8.2015 in WP No.11336/2012
Annexure-A22: Judgment dtd.10.8.2018 in SLP No.23260/2018

Annexures with reply statement:

Annexure-R1: Letter dtd.8.9.2017
Annexure-R2: Memo dtd.12.12.2017
Annexure-R3: Minutes of DSC dtd.16.2.2018
Annexure-R4: Letter dtd.2.3.2018
Annexure-R5: Minutes of DSC dtd.16.5.2018
Annexure-R6: DOPT OM dtd.10.2.2000
Annexure-R7: Memo dtd.2.8.2018
Annexure-R8: DOPT OM dtd.17.4.2009
Annexure-R9: DOPT OM dtd.18.6.2014
Annexure-R10: Order in WP.57935/2017

Annexures with rejoinder:

-NIL-

Annexures with additional reply:

Annexure-AR1: Undertaking given by the applicant
