

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH: BANGALORE  
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.170/00174/2019**

**DATED THIS THE 17<sup>th</sup> DAY OF JANUARY, 2020**

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

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

Sri. Sridatta B.Harikantra  
Aged about 37 years  
S/o. Bendya P.Harikantra  
C/o Bharat Computer Education  
Cuthino Road, Karwar  
District Uttara Kannada: 581301.

....Applicant

(By Advocate Shri V.P.Kulkarni)

Vs.

1. Union of India represented by  
Secretary to Government  
Ministry of Defence  
Sena Bhavan, South Block  
New Delhi-110001.
2. Flag Officer Commanding  
Headquarters, Western Naval Command  
Shahid Bhagat Singh Road  
Mumbai-400001.
3. Flag Officer Commanding  
Headquarters, Karnataka Naval Area  
Naval Base, Karwar-581308.
4. Chief Administrative Officer  
Command Civilian Personnel Officer  
Headquarters, Western Naval Command  
Shahid Bhagat Singh Road  
Mumbai-400 001.
5. Prashant Venkatesh Avarsekar  
S/o. Venkatesh Avarsekar  
Aged about 44 years  
Working as Master Gr.II  
Karnataka Naval Area  
R/a D.No.1866K/10  
Baba Nivas, Viveknanda Nagar  
Kodibag-581 303  
Karwar.

...Respondents

(By Advocates Sri M.Vasudeva Rao, Sr.PC for CG & Sri.P.Kamalesan for R5)

O R D E R

(PER HON'BLE SHRI C.V.SANKAR, MEMBER (ADMN))

This is the third round of litigation. The applicant had earlier filed OAs.No.1284/2013 & OA.No.157/2017 which were disposed of by this Tribunal vide orders dtd.25.1.2016(Annexure-A1) & 23.11.2017(Annexure-A2) respectively with a direction to the respondents to pass appropriate and speaking orders in accordance with law on the appointment and candidature of the applicant. When the applicant approached the respondents, the respondents have passed order dtd.24.1.2018(Annexure-A3) rejecting the candidature of the applicant. Being aggrieved by the same, the applicant has filed the present OA seeking the following relief:

- a. *Call for records of the case from the respondents and on perusal*
  - b. *Quash and set aside the impugned order bearing No.CS(II)/2577/RB/F/SO dated 24.1.2018 (Annexure A3) passed by the second respondent and issue a consequent direction to give appointment order to the applicant in the post of Master Grade II without any further loss of time.*
  - c. *Grant any other order/direction as deemed fit by this Hon'ble Tribunal to the applicant in the facts and circumstances of the case including an order as to costs of this OA, in the interests of justice.*
2. The case of the applicant is that the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent published advertisement in Employment News 20-26 August 2011 for filling up several posts in 4<sup>th</sup> respondent organisation(Annexure-A4). Sl.No.8 pertains to Master Grade II for which two posts were notified initially but later with the approval of competent authority one more vacancy was added. The applicant being eligible in all respects submitted his application along with necessary documents. He

participated in the selection process and came out successful. In the list of selected candidates for the post of Master Gr.II, the applicant is at Sl.No.2 in the reserve list(Annexure-A5). 5<sup>th</sup> respondent was also selected but he was not found fit for appointment as he did not possess certificate of Master 2<sup>nd</sup> Class ISV. The respondents issued a letter dtd.11.8.2014(Annexure-A6) directing the applicant to appear on 14.8.2014 to produce the original documents for completion of pre-recruitment procedural formalities before issue of final appointment order. He produced all the documents before the authorities. On 19.8.2014, the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent referred the applicant for medical examination and the District Hospital, Karwar issued the fitness certificate dtd.20.8.2014(Annexure-A7). One Gourish Gerunaik and another filed OA.No.49-50/2015 before this Tribunal questioning their non-selection to the post of Lascar 1<sup>st</sup> Class and selection of other candidates(private respondents) who were not qualified for the post. But the said OA was dismissed holding that the private respondents were qualified for selection to the post of Lascar 1<sup>st</sup> class vide order dtd.5.10.2016(Annexure-A8). Then the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent approached the Tribunal in OA.No.392/2016 regarding his non-selection to the post of Master Grade-II. But this Tribunal vide order dtd.15.2.2017 disposed of the same holding that since the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent is the respondent in OA.49-50/2015 and the principle evolved was beneficial to him, the benefits will be extended to him to that extent. The applicant submits that the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent was not a respondent in OA.No.49 & 50/2015 and he falsely represented and obtained an order in his favour. Further OA.No.49 & 50/2015 was in relation to Lascar 1<sup>st</sup> Class post whereas the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent was an aspirant for the post of Master Grade II. Following disposal of the OA.392/2016, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent issued appointment order dtd.7.12.2017 to the 5<sup>th</sup>

respondent(Annexure-A10). The official respondents have been mute spectators and have given appointment to the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent despite the fact that he was not found eligible for the same. After disposal of OA.No.1284/2013, the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent issued letters to the applicant on 11.3.2016 & 23.3.2016 directing him to report along with original certificates(Annexure-A11). It appears that the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent has made a complaint against the applicant to the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent on 18.4.2016 alleging that the applicant does not possess any qualification and has produced false certificates(Annexure-A12). On receipt of the complaint, the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent has taken undue interest in the matter and wrote a series of letters dtd.6.6.2016, 21.7.2016, 28.8.2016, 20.9.2016 & 29.9.2016(Annexure-A13 series) to the Registrar of Birth & Death, Karwar. On 3.12.2016, the Registrar of Birth and Death, Karwar has replied stating that the date of birth of the applicant shown as 15.4.1965 was found correct(Annexure-A14). A perusal of Annexure-A14 is clear that the same is a bogus and fabricated one as there is no Registrar of birth and death and in fact the said authority is Registrar of births and deaths. Then the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent wrote letters dtd.10.3.2017 & 12.4.2017 to the Headmaster, Adarsha Vidyalaya, Karwar regarding the applicant's age/date of birth and sought for confirmation from the school(Annexure-A15). The said school in the first instance intimated the date of birth of the applicant as 15.4.1982 but by its letter dtd.12.4.2017 intimated the correct date of birth of the applicant as 15.4.1981(Annexure-A16). The 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent also wrote a letter to M/s.Dinga Marine Fisheries on 30.11.2016 seeking for verification of genuineness of experience certificate issued to the applicant(Annexure-A17). Then the said firm replied that the experience certificate issued by it is correct(Annexure-A18). The 5<sup>th</sup> respondent appears to have forged and obtained

fabricated documents to spoil the career of the applicant. This is evident because it is stated in the impugned order that the respondents have verified the date of birth from Govt.Primary School, Baithkol, Govt.High School, Karwar and Registrar of Birth and Death. But the applicant studied in Govt.Primary Kannada School, Mallapur and not in Govt.Primary School, Baithkol. He has enclosed a copy of transfer certificate obtained from the said school(Annexure-A20) and transfer certificate issued by Adarsha Vidyalaya from where he passed SSLC in June 2008(Annexure-A21). Further, he approached the Registrar of Births & Deaths in regard to registration of date of birth as 15.4.1965 but he was informed that there is no such registration and issued a non-availability certificate in regard to alleged birth certificate enclosed by 5<sup>th</sup> respondent along with his complaint(Annexure-A22). It is clear from this that the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent has produced fabricated date of birth certificate and enclosed along with his complaint. The applicant has obtained his birth certificate from the Chief Registrar of Births and Deaths, Karwar(Annexure-A23) to show his correct date of birth as 15.4.1981. After disposal of another OA.157/2017 filed by him, the applicant submitted a representation dtd.5.1.2018(Annexure-A19) praying for issue of appointment and brought out as to how the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent who was originally declared not eligible has obtained employment by playing deception. But the said representation was rejected by impugned order at Annexure-A3. In order to obtain employment for himself at the cost of the applicant, the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent has made a false complaint and that has been acted upon by the official respondents. Denial of appointment to the applicant as seen from the impugned order is for the reason that the applicant being over aged. However, the applicant produced documents which show that he was born on 15.4.1981

and not on 15.4.1965. In fact he was medically examined and was declared fit. Therefore, there is nothing more remained for the respondents except to give appointment to the applicant. However, for extraneous consideration, the same has been denied to him. This is a classic case where the respondents have denied appointment to an eligible candidate and have given appointment to a person who was declared ineligible right in the beginning. The entire action is absolutely illegal and liable to be struck down by this Tribunal.

3. The respondents, on the other hand, have submitted in their reply statement that the Employment Notification pertains to the recruitment year 2013. Generally, the recruitment panel which was established in the year 2013 remained valid for only one year, but in view of Court cases, the matter got overextended till 2018. Therefore, now recruitment panel got expired. Further, as per existing SRO No.54/1982 and revised order No.39/2017(Annexure-R1 & R2 respectively), all unfilled vacancies to be filled by promotion of employees working in the organisation, failing which vacant position to be filled by Direct recruitment, therefore, all previous unfilled vacancies were now filled by yearly DPC's and no vacancy available in Master Gr.II. The impugned order(Annexure-A3) clearly speaks that respondents have done detailed examination of applicant's date of birth certificate and the transfer certificates by checking their genuineness from concerned government authorities which makes it evident that the date of birth of the applicant is 15.4.1965 bearing registration No.10/1965 with date of registration as May 1965(Annexure-R3). Further, the verification of school records at Govt. Primary and High School, Karwar also reveal that the date of birth of the applicant is 15.4.1965(Annexure-R4). The applicant had applied for the post of Master Grade II in response to the advertisement published in

Employment News dtd.20-26 Aug 2011. The age limit prescribed for the post of Master Grade II is between 18 to 40 years. However, the age of the applicant on the crucial date was beyond 40 years i.e. 46 years as on 1.7.2011. Therefore, on this ground, the applicant's appointment to the post of Master Gr.II was denied. The 5<sup>th</sup> respondent's complaint is an eye opener for the respondents and therefore, to confirm and cross examine the issue highlighted in the complaint letter, concerned authorities were approached. There is no undue interest on the part of the respondents as has been alleged by the applicant. Being a responsible government organisation under Min. of Defence, it is the duty of the respondents to reconfirm and examine any complaint received at its office to check its veracity. Therefore, complaint of the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent was cross examined before relying on the allegation against the applicant. By doing this activity, the respondents have not done anything which violates the law of natural justice. However, all efforts were being made to verify the antecedents of the applicant which is required as per government regulations, prior to applicant's recruitment. It is utmost importance as the recruitment is for a post related to support Indian Naval Ships and any breach could affect the security and safety. Finally, on examination, Registrar of Birth and Death, Karwar has replied that the applicant's date of birth shown as 15.4.1965 was found correct. Further for confirming genuineness of applicant's date of birth, a letter was sent to the Head Master, Govt. High School, Uttar Kannada, District Karwar Taluk located at Baithkhol Village vide letter dtd.29.4.2016(Annexure-R5) where the applicant has studied from 1<sup>st</sup> std. to VII std. From various sources, it has come to light that M/s Dinga Marine Fisheries is a family business boat, therefore it is evident that certificate was issued as per requirement of the applicant and the same was

verified as genuine by same organisation. The applicant had made undue influence on various departments to make his documents viable for seeking the job but his physical appearance will tell the truth. The seal & signature in Annexure-A22 is similar to Annexure-A14 on comparison. In Annexure-A22 the seal in the certificate is mentioned as Registrar of Birth and Death. Therefore, missing of simple 's' does not prove that the letter annexed as A14 is bogus and fabricated one.

4. The respondents submit that the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent has filed OA.No.392/2016 which is disposed of by this Tribunal. And due to non compliance of order in the said OA, the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent had filed contempt petition No.85/2017(Annexure-R6). Therefore, complying the order passed in OA.No.392/2016, they have issued appointment order to the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent. Therefore, the contention that the official respondents have been mute spectators and have given appointment to the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent despite the fact that the individual was not found eligible for the same is denied and devoid of merit. No illegal action is involved in doing so. Therefore, the OA being devoid of merit is liable to be dismissed.
5. The 5<sup>th</sup> respondent has filed reply statement stating that he was made respondent No.10 in OA.No.1284/2013 filed by the applicant. The applicant filed a memo on 6.1.2014(Annexure-R1) with a prayer to delete the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent in that OA. And now after a period of 6 years, again the applicant challenges the selection of the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent in this OA. The 5<sup>th</sup> respondent was not a party in OA.No.49 & 50/2015 but whereas the Counsel for 5<sup>th</sup> respondent had appeared in that OA.49 & 50/2015 for respondents No.5 to 9 in that OA. When the Court put a query on the Counsel whether the facts of OA.392/2016 filed by the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent was also similar to that of OA.49 & 50/2015, the Counsel stated that



there is a difference and distinction in both the cases. Therefore, there was no substance regarding the allegation that the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent misled the court. The applicant's claim that his date of birth is 15.4.1981 is not correct. The applicant was able to manage to get a certificate from Chief Registrar of Births & Deaths, City Municipal Council, Karwar dtd.22.5.2018 without the signature of Registrar of Birth and Death, contrary to the earlier certificate wherein the date of birth is mentioned as 15.4.1965 by the same office, with the signature of Birth & Death issued by them on 5.12.2013. The applicant had filed an application under Section 13.3. of Registration of Births and Deaths Act at J.M.F.C.II Court, Karwar and the same is registered on 16.2.2018. The JMFC Court, Karwar referred the matter to 'Lok Adalat' and accordingly before the Lok Adalath, the parties settled the matter. In accordance with the settlement, the Lok Adalath directed the respondents to make an entry of birth of the applicant as 15.4.1981 vide order dtd.22.4.2018(Annexure-R2). Therefore, the applicant's age on the date of application for the post of Master Grade II vide notification dtd. August 2011 was about 45 years and not eligible to apply for that post. The applicant had not produced any concrete evidence to prove that his date of birth was 15.4.1981. Therefore, the OA is liable to be dismissed.

6. The applicant has filed rejoinder reiterating the submission already made in the OA and submits that the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent had passed the Master Second Class Course on 18.5.2012(Annexure-A29) and the last date for submitting the application for the post of Master Gr.II was 26.8.2011(Annexure-A28). As such the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent had not at all passed the Master Second Class as on the date of submitting the application. After passing of the examination, the candidate has to work as Master II for a period of 2 years to have an eligibility. In the present

case, the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent has produced the experience certificate issued by International Seaport Dredging Ltd., Tamil Nadu to the effect that he has worked as a Master in a Survey Vessel from July 2009 to 2011(Annexure-A24). The 5<sup>th</sup> respondent has also produced another certificate issued by Sea Eagle Dredging Marine Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. for the same period alleging that he worked as a Master in Survey Vessel from 17.7.2009 to 10.12.2011 in Mumbai(Annexure-A25). During the same period, the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent has worked in Kesari Marine Service Engine Room, Kakinada, Andhra Pradesh for the period 1.10.2008 to 31.12.2010(Annexure-A26). The 5<sup>th</sup> respondent has worked in Dredging Infrastructure Company from 30.11.2006 to 1.2.2008 (Annexure-A27). The applicant submits that the Kesari Marine Services' certificate is a genuine certificate as the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent had no eligibility or knowledge to work as a Master. These experience certificates are prior to passing of Master Certificate. When the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent was not given appointment, he filed OA.No.392/2016 and there is no direction to give appointment to the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent(Annexure-A31). But, however, the Naval department passed illegal order giving appointment to the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent(Annexure-A32). The applicant has studied in Adarsha Vidyalaya, Mallapur and he has studied primary school in Govt. Primary Kannada School, Mallapur and also he has completed High School in the said school. He passed 7<sup>th</sup> std. in the year 1996 and has passed SSLC in the year 2008. During the undisputed period of time, his date of birth was mentioned as 15.4.1981. He has also enclosed copies of Aadhar card, PAN card, Driving License and Election Commission Identity Card(Annexures-A33, 34, 35 & 36 respectively).

7. The applicant further submits that the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent appears to have approached the Circle Inspector, Karwar requesting to take necessary action against the applicant. Then the Circle Inspector, Karwar has called for a report from the Block Education Officer, Karwar who after obtaining a report had sent a report stating that the applicant had studied in Adarsha Vidyalaya, Mallapur and another person by the same name has studied in Govt. High School, Karwar(Annexure-A37). It has been mentioned in the said report that the name of the applicant is not found in the records of the Govt. Primary School, Baithkol, Karwar. But the name of the applicant was found in the register of the High School from 8<sup>th</sup> std and his date of birth has been mentioned as 15.4.1965. The applicant submits that he has not at all studied in the Govt. Primary High School, Baithkol, Karwar and hence the date of birth entered in the said certificate is 15.4.1965 which does not pertain to the applicant but belongs to some other person having the same name. The applicant passed the Master Second Class certificate conducted by the Min. of Shipping and Road Transport. In the said certificate, his date of birth is mentioned as 15.4.1981(Annexure-A38). The applicant has submitted all the documents before the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent but he has not considered the same but passed the impugned order which is verbatim similar to the complaint made by the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent. The impugned order is illegal and erroneous and hence the same is liable to be set aside.
8. We have heard the Learned Counsels for both the parties and perused the materials placed on record in detail. Both the parties have filed their written arguments note. This issue has been going around several times since the issue of the employment notification in 2011. The simple issue to be decided is whether the date of birth of the applicant is 15.04.1981 as claimed by him or

15.04.1965 as claimed by the respondents. The applicant would state that he had studied in Govt.Primary School, Mallapur and not in Govt.Primary School, Baithkol. The respondents would state that the applicant had studied in the Govt.Primary School and High School in Karwar revealing the date of birth as 15.04.1965. If the year 1965 is the correct year of birth, the applicant is not eligible for appearing in the selection vide the notification of 2011. The applicant on his own produced several records from the school including the Registrar of Births & Deaths. Similar certificates are also being produced by the respondents stating that his date of birth is only in 1965. In their latest written submissions dtd.26.12.2019, the respondents also bring in the fact regarding the death certificate of the applicant's father vide Annexure-R11 reflecting the date of death of the applicant's father as 25.06.1975 and the same was confirmed by the extracts of Registrar dated back in 1975 maintained by the Chief Registrar of Births & Deaths(Annexure-R12). The name of the father of the applicant is shown as Bendya Purso Harikantra and his date of death is shown as 25.06.1975. The respondents also show the copy of the attestation form at Annexure-R13 wherein the applicant himself has shown the name of his father as Late Bandya Pursu Harikantra. The respondents would state that the name of the applicant's father mentioned in the Voter ID is Benday and in the transfer certificate annexed by the applicant, his father's name is shown as Bandya Harikantra. The applicant, on the other hand, would claim that his father's name was Bendya Pursu Harikantra whereas the extract from the Death Register shows the name as Bendya Purso Harikantra and it is not his father. In this peculiar case, there are two sets of records relating to another person supposedly having the same name as that of the applicant wherein in the school records, the date of birth is

mentioned as 15.04.1965 as claimed by the respondents. There is another set of records with the name of the applicant and the entry showing the date of birth as 15.04.1981. When the SSLC certificate details were discussed in one of the sittings of this Tribunal, on seeing the date on which the applicant had passed the SSLC namely in 2008, this Tribunal wanted to know as to why the applicant had passed the examination of SSLC after 27 years of his alleged date of birth, and the reply given was that the applicant had passed the examination as a private candidate and that is why the photograph on the SSLC Mark Sheet appears to be that of an older person(Document No.13 produced along with written arguments note by the applicant). Now looking at the death certificate produced by the respondents, the name of the father of the applicant and the name appearing on the certificate are almost exactly the same and therefore looking at both sets of documents, it is not clear as to whether the applicant can be given the benefit of doubt relating to the date of his birth. If, as stated by the respondents, the death certificate produced for the year 1975 is indeed that of the father of applicant, there is no question of believing the applicant's claim that he was born in 1981. The respondents have also in their written arguments stated that the doctrine of 'Ante Litem Motam' translating to 'before the lawsuit was started' will apply squarely in this case that if something was done before a legal dispute arose, it can be considered that the declarant has no motive to lie. The respondents would state that in the present case, the applicant was not possessing of Annexure-A23 viz., Birth Certificate issued by the Registrar of Births and Deaths dtd.22.5.2018 on the date when the OA.157/2017 was filed and the same was obtained by him in May 2018 after the disposal of the OA.No.157/2017 in November, 2017. They would also state that the applicant

may be subjected to bone ossification test for the purpose of determining his age. We would not like to get into any further issues in the proceedings including whether the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent was appointed on wrong presumption or otherwise etc., since apparently in a separate set of proceedings before this Tribunal in OA.No.739/2019, his claim against his removal from service has also been dismissed by this Tribunal.

9. Considering the facts and the documents produced, we do not find any merit in the OA and hence dismissed. No costs.

(C.V.SANKAR)  
MEMBER (A)

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

/ps/

**Annexures referred to by the applicant in OA.No.170/00174/2019**

Annexure-A1: Copy of order dtd.25.1.2016 in OA.No.1284/13

Annexure-A2: Copy of order dtd.23.11.2017 in OA No.157/17

Annexure-A3: Copy of impugned order dtd.24.1.2018  
Annexure-A4: Copy of employment notification  
Annexure-A5: Copy of revised Board proceedings dtd.10.6.13  
Annexure-A6: Copy of letter dtd.11.8.2014  
Annexure-A7: Copy of letter dtd.19.8.2014 and medical fitness Certificate dtd.20.8.2014  
Annexure-A8: Copy of order dtd.5.10.2016 in OA.No.49-50/15  
Annexure-A9: Copy of order dtd.15.2.2017 in OA.No.392/16  
Annexure-A10: Copy of appointment order dtd.7.12.2017  
Annexure-A11: Copy of letters dtd.11.3.2016 & 23.3.2016  
Annexure-A12: Copy of complaint dtd.18.4.2016  
Annexure-A13: Copies of letters by R3 regarding DOB of applicant  
Annexure-A14: Copy of alleged letter dtd.3.12.2016  
Annexure-A15: Copy of letter dtd.10.3.2017 to Adarsha Vidyalaya  
Annexure-A16: Copy of reply dtd.12.4.2017 by Adarsha Vidyalaya  
Annexure-A17: Copy of letter dtd.30.11.2016 from R3  
Annexure-A18: Copy of reply dtd.21.12.2016 from Dinga Marine  
Annexure-A19: Copy of representation dtd.5.1.2018  
Annexure-A20: Copy of TC showing date of birth of applicant  
Annexure-A21: Copy of TC from Adarsha Vidyalaya  
Annexure-A22: Copy of Non availability certificate dtd.4.7.2018  
Annexure-A23: Copy of birth certificate of applicant

**Annexures with reply statement:**

Annexure-R1: Copy of SRO No.54/1981  
Annexure-R2: Copy of revised order No.39/2017  
Annexure-R3: Copy of letter dtd.3.12.2016  
Annexure-R4: Copy of birth certificate  
Annexure-R5: Copy of letter dtd.29.4.2016  
Annexure-R6: Copy of contempt petition No.85/2017

**Annexures with reply statement of R5:**

Annexure-R1: Copy of proceedings order sheet dtd.6.2.2014 and memo dtd.6.1.14 in  
OA.No.1284/2013  
Annexure-R2: Copy of proceedings before JMC II Court, Karwar and Lok Adalath order  
dtd.22.4.18

**Annexures with rejoinder:**

Annexure-A24: The copy of the certificate  
Annexure-A25: The copy of the experience certificate  
Annexure-A26: The copy of the certificate issued by Kesari Marine Services, Kakinada,  
Andhra Pradesh  
Annexure-A27: The copy of the certificate issued by the Competent Authority  
Annexure-A28: The copy of the publication dtd.26.8.2011  
Annexure-A29: The copy of the certificate  
Annexure-A30: The copy of the letter dtd.1.4.2013  
Annexure-A31: The copy of the order in OA.No.329/2016  
Annexure-A32: The copy of the appointment order

Annexure-A33: The copy of the Aadhar Card

Annexure-A34: The copy of the PAN card

Annexure-A35: The copy of the Driving License

Annexure-A36: The copy of the Election Commission Identity Card

Annexure-A37: The copy of the report submitted by the Block Education Officer to the  
Circle Inspector & translated copy

Annexure-A38: The copy of the certificate issued by the Government of India, Ministry  
of Shipping & Road Transport

\*\*\*\*\*