

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench: New Delhi

OA No. 759/96
OA No. 1260/96

New Delhi this the 13th day of December 1999

(5)

Hon'ble Mr. Justice V. Rajagopala Reddy, VC (J)
Hon'ble Mr. R.K. Ahooja, Member (A)

OA No. 759-96

Jagjit Singh,
Sub-Inspector, D.1941,
A-20, New Police Lines,
Guru Teg Bahadur Nagar,
New Delhi-110009.

Through: Ms. Raman Oberoi, Advocate ... Applicant

vs.

1. Union of India through
Secretary Ministry of Home Affairs,
North Block,
Central Secretariat,
New Delhi.
2. NCT of Delhi
through Chief Secretary,
Old Secretariat,
Delhi.
3. Commissioner of Police,
Police Head Quarters,
I.T.O., Delhi.
4. Sukhbir Singh, D623

(Service to Respondents from serial No 4 onwards
to be effected through Respondent No. 3.)

5. Pushkal Sharma, D 1931	17. Rajbir Singh, D 162
6. Ashwani Kumar, D 1912	18. Anand Kumar, D1926
7. Abhirup Banerji, D 72	19. Sadar Singh, D1896
8. Raj Kumar, D 31	20. Rajinder Parshad D 213
9. Rajender Parshad , D569	21. Durga Parshad D 44
10. Om Dass ; D 1894	22. Narender Singh D 1890
11. Kailash Chander D 1927	23. Shahnoor Khan D130
12. Ravinder Kumar , D 166	24. Ganga Ram D1470
13. Umesh Singh D 1935	25. Narendra Chawla D 1911
14. Kailash Chand, D 1915	26. Rajendra Prasad D1937
15. Ramesh Chand, 620	27. Rajbir ,D1923
16. Surinder Pal D 1919	28. Dinesh Tiwari D106

....2/-

pu

29 Jai Kishan D1901
30 Laxmi Chand D 625
31 Bhagwan Kumar D 85
32 Avinash Chander
D1927
33 Rajender Kishore
D 1903
34 Yatinder Kumar
D 628
35 Har Surender Pal
D 214
36 Suresh Kumar D1889
37 Bhrahma Pal D1907
38 Radha Raman D 1908
39 Ram Kumar D 109
40 Rajesh Kumar D1895
41 Satya Prakash D 1893
42 Rajesh Kumar D 1924
43 Santosh Kumar D 1938
44 Naval Kishore D 34
45 Ram Dal D 1920
46 Niranjan Singh
D1914
47 Sanjeev Gupta D 505
48 Satya Pal Singh
D 1946
49 Rajbir Sharma D 2038
50 Manga Singh D 1954
51 Jhagran Singh D 1929
52 Rajinder Singh D1917
53 KawaL Kishore D367
54 Chaman Lal D 1909
55 Rajinder Pal D87
56 Surender Kumar D 1876
57 Paras Nath D 1950
58 Narendra Mohan D 1951
59 Banwari Lal D 1953
60 Lekh Raj D 1956
61 Ram Mehar D336
62 Ved Bhushan D2003
63 Ved Singh D 2027
64 Ram Phal D 2026
65 Ashok Kumar D2004
66 Ram Kumar D 2022
67 Makhan Singh D 2001
68 Lakhinder Singh D 2018
69 Jagdish Yadav D 2020
70 Abhay Singh D 2024
71 Sukhvinder Singh D2008
72 Ushil Tyagi D 2016
73 Rajender Pal D 2017
75 Raja Ram D2654
76 Sher Singh D 1097
77 Laxmi Chand D 2635
78 Gnanan Singh D 2636
79 Mohan Lal D 1487
80 Azad Singh D 350
81 Raj Kumar D 1873
82 Rajinder Singh D 1582
83 Saheb Ram D 1584
84 Mahitab Singh D 1533
85 Ranbir Singh D 1692
86 Pratap Singh D 1723
87 Hoshiar Singh D 1764
88 Bharat Singh D 1785
89 Vijay Rawal D 1767

(17)

90 Ramesh Kumar D 1804
91 Rai Singh D 1770
92 Kishore Kumar D 1841
93 Narender Kumar D 301
94 Hari Singh D 1332
95 Balram Solanki D 1763
96 Arun Kumar D 1881
97 Rajender Kumar D 167
98 Tejpal Singh D 1816
99 Virender Singh D 100
100 Anil Kumar D 1947
101 Surender Kumar D 1949
102 Azad Singh D 2025
103 Om Prakash D 705
104 Rajinder Singh D 2042
105 Sanjeev Kumar D 108
106 Satya Pal D 517
107 Rarender Singh D 135
108 Ranjit Ekka D-126
109 Samay Singh D 1775
110 Om Prakash D-2011
111 Karam Singh D 2723
112 Kundan Singh D 2642
113 Shyam Lal D 2650
114 Dal Singh D 2652
115 Hari Singh D 2654
116 Daya Chand D 2659
117 Sat Pal D 563

118 Banwari Lal D 2663
119 Anand Sagar D 1866
120 Bhupat Ram D 2651
121 Khilari Singh D 2657
122 Mahesh Kumar D 2050
123 Lalit Mohan D 2052
124 Har Kripal Singh D 2053
125 Sanjeev Kumar D 2055
126 Peeyush Kumar D 2056
127 Abhay Kumar D 2057
128 Rajender Singh D 2058
129 Shahastra Bau D 2063
130 Mir Singh D 2064
131 Preet Singh D 2065
132 Madan Gopal D 2087
133 Ashok Kumar D 2068
134 Rajinder Bhatia D 2070
135 Krishan Pal D 2074
136 Sunil Kumar D 2077
137 Ganpat Ram D 2080
138 Joginder Kumar D 2085
139 Satish Kumar D 2086
140 Jagdish Kumar Prasad D 2094
141 Mool Chand D 2665
142 Sardar Singh D 2290
143 Murli Dhar D 2274
144 Mangal Chand D 2473
145 Shri Krishan D 2491

Through: - - - - -

On

17
17
17
17
17

(8)

DA No. 1260/96

Vishnu Dev Madan,
Sub-Inspector, D-1409
13 A, Guru Angad Nagar Extension,
Delhi-110092.

Through Ms. Raman Oberoi, Advocate

...Applicant

vs.

1. Union of India through
Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs
North Block,
Central Secretariat,
New Delhi
2. NCT of Delhi
through Chief Secretary,
old Secretariat,
Delhi.
3. Commissioner of Police,
Police Head Quarters,
I.T.O., Delhi.
4. Om Prakash, D 1413
(Service to Respondents from S. No. 4 onwards to be
effected through Respondent No. 3)
5. Ram Swaroop, D 1418
7. Rajesh Kumar, D 1583
9. Iqbal Singh, D 1525
11. Tilak Raj Mongia, D 1609
13. Bhup Singh, D 1520
15. Atinder Kumar, D 1516
17. Satya Dev, D 1586
19. Parkash Chander, D 1557
21. Harpal Singh, D 1524
23. Hira Lal, D 1603
25. Ashok Kumar, D 1602
27. Narendra Kumar, D 1631
28. Ved Prakash, D 1634
29. Mohun Swaroop, D 1632
6. Manohar Singh, D 1565
8. Iqbal Mohd., D 1563
10. Ved Prakash, D 1540
12. Najmus Saad, D 1534
14. Raj Singh, D 1536
16. Jai Kumar, D 1527
18. Virender Kumar, D 1592
20. Subhash Tandon, D 1533
22. Mahipal Singh, D 1531
24. Ram Phal, D 1604
26. Raj Kumar, D 1627
28. Harish Kumar, D 1570
30. Dharambir Singh, D 1638
32. Sir Raj Singh, D 1545

contd... 2/-

33. Hanuman Dass, D 1546
 35. Krishan Kumar, D 1629
 37. Chamel Singh, D 1571
 39. Jaspal Singh, D 1611
 41. Yad Ram, D 1543
 43. Subhash Chander, D 1637
 45. Ramesh Chander, D 1695
 47. Om Prakash D 1671
 49. Ram Singh, D 1861
 51. Jitender Kumar, D 1708
 53. Mohinder Singh, D 1675
 55. Suresh Kumar, D 1712
 57. Sheal Nindhi, D 1673
 59. Raj Kumar Singh, D 1664
 61. Mohinder Singh, D 1794
 63. Roshan Lal, D 1688
 65. Budhi Parkash, D 1701
 67. Satya Dev, D 1658
 69. Satyavir Singh, D 1657
 71. Brahm Parkash, D 1645
 73. Ram Kumar, D 1649
 75. Murari Lal, D 1722
 77. Surinder Singh, D 1724
 79. Manohar Lal, D 1676
 81. Bani Singh, D 1666
 83. Laxmi Narayan, D 1759
 85. Harcharan Verma, D 1762
 87. Balbir Singh, D 1773
 89. Dharanvir Singh, D 1772
 91. Ashok Kumar, D 1792
 93. Rajiv Bhatnagar, D 1778
 95. Ram Kumar, D 1758
 97. Radhey Shyam, D 1780
 99. Ishwar Singh, D 1650
 101. Satyavir Singh, D 1802
 103. Niyampal Singh, D 1760
 105. Inder Singh, D 1783 (SC)
 34. Karan Singh, D 1697
 36. Surender Kumar, D 1573
 38. Ajay Kumar, D 1589
 40. Om Prakash, D 422
 42. Satish Kumar, D 1642
 44. Vinod Kumar, D 1669
 46. Sarabjit Singh, D 1698
 48. Rajender Sharma D 1714
 50. Mahabir Singh, D 1816
 52. Ashok Kumar, D 1705
 54. Vinod Kumar, D 1680
 56. Ram Singh, D 1700
 58. Anjani Kumar, D 1663
 60. Ranbir Singh, D 1660
 62. Satish Chander, D 1643
 64. Balwant Singh, D 1653
 66. Baljit Singh, D 1656
 68. Satpal, D 1668
 70. Jagbir Singh, D 1648
 72. Rajender Singh, D 1644
 74. Raja Ram, D 1728
 76. Bhim Sain, D 1752
 78. Bholu Ram, D 1613
 80. Ran Singh, D 1612
 82. Surya Parkash, D 1777
 84. Harsh Mittar, D 1601
 86. Balbir Singh, D 1773
 88. Vimal Kumar, D 1803
 90. Mahipal Singh, D 1809
 92. Balraj Singh, D 1768
 94. Ram Chander, D 1765
 96. Laxmi Narain, D 1766
 98. Rajiv Rattan, D 1729
 100. Has Mohd., D 1785
 102. Satish Chander, D 1805
 104. Inder Singh, D 1817 (SC)
 106. Anil Kapoor, D 1785

contd...3/-

See

6
8 8
20

107. Om Parkash, D 1814 (SC)
 109. Rajesh Kumar, D 1833
 111. Vipin Kumar, D 1858
 113. Suresh Chander, D 1851
 115. Satya Pal, D 1827
 117. Ram Pal Singh, D 1830
 119. Sher Singh, D 1834
 121. Papinder Pal Singh, D 1842
 123. Rohtash Dhindhwal, D 1822
 125. Attar Singh, D 1848
 127. Surat Singh, D 659
 129. Jagpal Singh, D 664
 131. Joginder Pal, D 2368
 133. Biri Singh, D 2410
 135. Ran Singh, D 798
 137. Jai Kishan, D 429
 139. Suresh Kumar, D 359
 141. Swantantr Singh, D 257
 143. Gafdar Ali, D 14
 145. Girish Kumar, D 151
 147. Sajjan Kumar, D 1750
 149. Jagdish Chander, D 627
 151. Virender Singh, D 1093
 153. Suresh Kumar, D 21
 155. Om Bir Singh, D 1005
 158. Jagjit Singh, D 193
 159. Om Dutt, D 319
 161. Sudhir Kumar, D 1090
 163. Pardeep Kumar, D 1006
 165. Virender Dutt, D 663
 167. Randhir Singh, D 1626
 169. Kali Ram, D 1715
 171. Mohinder Singh, D 1360
 173. Shiv Dayal, D 1017
 175. Ram Singh, D 1719
 177. Harjinder Singh, D 1375
 179. Ram Chander, D 514
 181. Ramesh Chander, D 1685
 108. Kanta Parshad, D 1838
 110. Chander Kant, D 1852
 112. Ram Kishan, D 1856
 114. Raj Kumar, D 1826
 116. Rajinder Singh, D 1854
 118. Veer Singh, D 1847
 120. Parvinder Singh, D 1825
 122. Suresh Chander, D 1829
 124. Dhawal Singh, D 543
 126. Bhim Singh, D 483
 128. Ram Parkash, D 660
 130. Ram Singh, D 272
 132. Roop Ram, D 8377
 134. Mohd. Iqbal, D 59
 136. Anil Kumar, D 494
 138. Rajiv Kumar, D 424
 140. Surinder Kumar, D 996
 142. Balwan Singh, D 721
 144. Raj Singh, D 91
 146. Ranesh Kumar, D 232
 148. Kulbhushan, D 348
 150. Mahesh Kumar, D 123
 152. Jai Singh, D 963
 154. Shiv Parshad, D 877
 156. Ved Parkash, D 430
 158. Sher Singh, D 714
 160. Jagdish Prashad, D 521
 162. Surjit Kumar, D 108
 164. Pukhtiar Singh, D 933
 166. Ranbir Singh, D 1717
 168. Rajender Parshad, D 1875
 170. Narendra Singh, D 1872
 172. Bishan Mohan, D 710
 174. Om Parkash, D 1606
 176. Dal Chand, D 1663
 178. Ranjit Kumar, D 241
 180. Umed Singh, D 1064
 182. Sadanand Rai, D 438

contd... 4/-

0 6 0

(2)

183. Ishwar Singh, D 547
 185. sarup Singh, D 2108
 187. Gajraj Singh, D 168
 189. Vinod Kumar, D 1877
 191. Surya Kant, D 725
 193. Rajbir Singh, D 321
 195. Pushkal Sharma, D 1931
 197. Abhirup Banerji, D 72
 199. Rajender parshad, D 569
 201. Kailash Chander, D 1927
 203. Umesh Singh, D 1935
 205. Ramesh Chand, D 620
 207. Rajbir Singh, D 162
 209. Sadar Singh, D 1896
 211. Durga parshad, D 44
 213. shancor Khan, D 130
 215. Narendra Chawla, D 19
 217. Rajbir S D 1923
 219. Jai Kishan, D 1901
 221. Bhagwan Kumar, D 85
 223. Rajender Kishore, D 1903
 225. Har Surender Pal, D 214
 228. Bhrahma Pal, D 1907
 229. Ram Kumar, D 109
 231. Satya parkash, D 1893
 233. Santosh Kumar, D 1936
 235. Ram Dal, D 1920
 237. Sanjeev Gupta, D 505
 239. Rajbir Sharma, D 2038
 241. Jhagram Singh, D 1929
 243. Kawal Kishore, D 367
 245. Rajinder Pal, D 87
 247. Paras Nath, D 1950
 249. Banwari Lal, D 1953
 251. Ram Mehar, D 336
 253. Ved Singh, D 2027
 255. Ashok Kumar, D 2004
 184. Hari Ram, D 76
 186. Grijinder pal Singh, D 1898
 188. Sunil Kumar, D 215
 190. Randhir Singh, D 624
 192. Vinod Kumar, D 1932
 194. Sukhbir Singh, D 623
 196. Ashwani Kumar, D 1912
 198. Raj Kumar, D 31
 200. Om Parkash, D 1894
 202. Ravinder Kumar, D 166
 204. Kailash Chand, D 1915
 206. Surender Pal, D 1919
 208. Anand Kumar, D 1926
 210. Rajinder Patshad, D 213
 212. Narendra Singh, D 1690
 214. Ganga Ram, D 1470
 216. Rajender Prasad, D 1937
 218. Dinesh Tiwari, D 106
 220. Laxmi Chand, D 625
 222. Avinash Chander, D 1927
 224. Yatinder Kumar, D 626
 226. Suresh Kumar, D 1389
 228. Radha Ram, D 1906
 230. Rajesh Kumar, D 1895
 232. Rajesh Kumar, D 1924
 234. Nawal Kishore, D 34
 236. Niranjan Singh, D 1914
 238. Satya Pal Singh, D 1946
 240. Mangan Singh, D 1954
 242. Rajinder Singh, D 1917
 244. Chaman Lal, D 1909
 246. Surender Kumar, D 1876
 248. Narendra Mohan, D 1951
 250. Lakh Raj, D 1956
 252. Ved Bhushan, D 2003
 254. Ram Phal, D 2026
 256. Ram Kumar, D 2002

(1) 01

contd... 5/-

B
51

257. Makhan Singh, D 2001
 259. Jagdish Yadav, D 2020
 261. Sukhvinder Singh, D 2008
 263. Rajender Pal, D 2017
 265. Sher Singh, D 1097
 267. Gnanan Singh, D 2636
 269. Azad Singh, D 350
 271. Rajinder Singh, D 1582
 273. Mahitab Singh, D 1533
 275. Pratap Singh, D 1723
 277. Bharat Singh, D 2785
 279. Ramesh Kumar, D 1804
 281. Kishore Kumar, D 1841
 283. Hari Singh, D 1332
 285. Arun Kumar, D 1881
 287. Tejpal Singh, D 1818
 289. Anil Kumar, D 1847
 291. Azad Singh, D 2025
 293. Rajinder Singh, D 2042
 295. Satya Pal, D 517
 297. Ranjit Ekka, D 126
 299. Om Parkash, D 2011
 301. Kundan Singh, D 2642
 303. Dal Singh, D 2652
 305. Daya Chand, D 2659
 307. Banwari Lal, D
 309. Bhupat Ram, D 2851
 311. Mahesh Kumar, D 2050
 313. Har Kirpal Singh, D 2053
 315. Peeyush Kumar, D 2056
 317. Rajender Singh, D 2058
 319. Mir Singh, D 2064
 321. Madan Gopal, D 2087
 323. Rajender Bhutia, D 2070
 325. Sunil Kumar, D 2077
 327. Joginder Kumar, D 2065
 329. Jagdish Prasad, D 2094
 331. Sardar Singh, D 2290
 333. Mangal Chand, D 2473

22

258. Lakhinder Singh, D 2018
 260. Abhay Singh, D 2024
 262. Sushil Tyagi, D 2016
 264. Raja Rama, D 2654
 266. Laxmi Chand, D 2635
 268. Mohan Lal, D 1487
 270. Raj Kumar, D 1873
 272. Saheb Ram, D 1584
 274. Rahbir Singh, D 1692
 276. Hoshidar Singh, D 1764
 278. Vijay Rawal, D 1767
 280. Rai Singh, D 1770
 282. Narender Kumar, D 301
 284. Balram Solanki, D 1763
 286. Rajinder Kumar, D 167
 288. Virender Singh, D 100
 290. Surender Kumar, D 1049
 292. Om Parkash, D 705
 294. Sanjeev Kumar, D 108
 296. Narender Singh, D 135
 298. Samay Singh, D 1775
 300. Karan Singh, D 2723
 302. Shyam Lal, D 2650
 304. Hari Singh, D 2654
 306. Sat Pal, D 563
 308. Anand Sagar, D 18886
 310. Khilari Singh, D 2657
 312. Lalit Mohan, D 2052
 314. Sanjeev, D 2055
 316. Abhay Kumar, D 2057
 318. Shahastra Baw, D 2063
 320. Preet Singh, D 2065
 322. Ashok Kumar, D 2063
 324. Krishan Pal, D 2074
 326. Ganpat Ram, D 2080
 328. Satish Kumar, D 2086
 330. Mool Chand, D 2665
 332. Murli Dhar, D 2274
 334. Shri Kishan, D 2491

RGP panel auto

Or (By Advocate:- Shri Rajinder潘德)

ORDER (Oral)

By Mr. R.K. Ahooja, Member (A)

23

Both the OAs arise out of the decision of the Departmental Promotion Committee on promotion from the rank of Sub-Inspector to Inspector in Delhi Police. Since both OAs raise similar issues for consideration, these are being disposed of by this common order.

2. The applicants in both the OAs are working as Sub-Inspector and are eligible on the basis of the seniority, for admission to list 'F' (Exe.) and subsequently to be promoted as Inspector. The Govt. of India sanctioned the upgradation of posts at various levels from Constable to Assistant Commission of Police by an order dated 1.6.94. A total of 337 vacancies of Inspectors thereby became available. A DPC was held to consider the cases of the eligible Sub Inspectors on 12.8.94. Both the applicants herein were, however, not approved for promotion.

3. The case of the applicants is firstly that the said posts of Inspectors for which the DPC was held were the result of upgradation which was undertaken, on the admission of the respondents themselves, in order to remove long standing stagnation in the rank of Sub-Inspectors. In view of this position the newly created posts were to be filled up on the basis of seniority and not on the basis of the normal rules of promotion of Delhi Police. The second contention of the applicants is that the DPC did not consider the cases of the applicants in terms of their

Own

-10-

2A

own guidelines which were determined by a Circular dated 23.9.92. It is contended on behalf of the applicants that the first guideline required that officers having atleast three 'Good' reports and without any 'below average' or adverse remarks during the last five years were to be promoted. On the other hand the format provided for recording the annual assessment of the officers had no provision for the grading of 'Good'. Therefore, the case of the applicants herein was not properly considered and there was no proper application of mind on the part of the DPC. Thirdly, it has been contended that a number of other Sub-Inspectors with bad records and certainly inferior record than those of the applicants have been declared fit for promotion ignoring the claims of the applicants. The fourth contention on behalf of the applicants is that the DPC has taken into account certain minor punishments of Censure even though such a minor punishment is not a bar to promotion. Lastly, it has been contended that even in regard to promotion made on adhoc basis, the respondents having not followed the criteria of seniority.

4. The respondents have on the other hand stated that the cases of the applicants were considered in accordance with the rules. They point out that the Govt. of India while upgrading the posts had included a stipulation that the newly created posts would be filled up in accordance with the regular promotion rules. They also state that the cases of the applicants were duly and properly considered by the DPC and they were not found fit for promotion. They also refute the allegation that persons with inferior

An

records have been promoted. In regard to adhoc promotions they submit that only those persons have been given adhoc promotions who were approved for regular promotion by the DPC.

25

5. We have heard the counsel at great length. In regard to the first question raised by the learned counsel for the applicant viz; that the new vacancies were really a matter of upgradation, we are unable to find any merit therein. Normally, if a modified procedure is to be followed then the scheme for upgradation itself provides for a modified form of selection. In the present case the Presidential order conveying the creation of the new vacancies dated 22.6.94 provides as follows:-

"In pursuance of this cadre review, the up-dradation/abolition of posts may effected and the posts in Higher grade be filled in accordance with Recruitment Rules".

6. Clearly, the available vacancies were to be filled up in accordance with the Recruitment Rules and not by seniority alone.

7. As regards the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant that persons with much inferior record have been promoted reliance has been placed on the decision of the Tribunal in OA No. 1652/94 decided on 20.5.99 Bhim Singh Vs. Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs. We have perused that decision. After considering the case of those who were alleged to have been promoted despite inferior records the Tribunal decided that the cases of the applicants in that OA deserves to be reviewed by the DPC. We find

On

that the order of the Tribunal has been stayed by the High Court of Delhi. Even otherwise we do not consider that merely because other persons have been found fit by the DPC does not mean by itself that the applicants herein, even though otherwise unsuitable for promotion in terms of the promotion rules should still be considered fit for promotion.

(26)

8. In regard to the plea that in respect of adhoc promotions the criteria of seniority has not been followed, we find that the adhoc promotions were ordered because these related to vacancies which are of a consequential nature inasmuch as they would have become available only after the officers of Inspector rank were promoted to the rank of Asstt. Commissioner of Police. In these circumstances, we are unable to find any fault with the action of the respondents in filling up the adhoc vacancies from amongst those Sub-Inspectors who had been found fit for regular promotion by the DPC.

9. We need re-produce only the guideline relevant to the purpose of this OA, which reads as follows:-

"Officers having atleast 3 Good or above reports during the last 5 years were recommended in general category. However, SC/ST candidates were adjudged separately amongst themselves, as required under the brochure for SCs/STs".

10. We have examined the ACR Dossiers of the two applicants and we find that the relevant period for consideration was 88-89 to 93-94. The ACRs format for 88-89 had a classification titled "Class of report

De

'A', 'B' and 'C'. Although the provision of Punjab Police Rules describing this classification has not been produced before us, learned counsel for respondents on instructions explains that classification 'A' stands for 'Very Good', 'B' stands for 'Satisfactory to Good' and 'C' is 'Average and Below Average'. From 1991 to 1992 the format of the ACR was changed and the provisions were made for overall grading as follows:-

Outstanding/Very Good/	Average/Below Average.
------------------------	------------------------

11. It is clear that neither in the format in use prior to 1991-92 nor ~~and then~~ introduced in 1991-92 there was a specific grading known as 'Good'. In view of this the classification 'B' in the earlier ACR Format and 'Average' in the later format could not by itself mean a grading below 'Good'. This point was also dealt with by this Tribunal in OA-481/97 decided on 11.4.97. On the perusal of the record of the applicants in that case the Tribunal came to the following conclusion:-

"Had there been a category of 'good', the petitioner would have been graded 'good' for all the three years, where his grading has been shown as 'average'; therefore the average seems to be equivalent to 'good'.

12. A similar view has been taken by the Tribunal in other related cases also. Therefore, as to whether the grading of 'average' is to be recorded as 'good' or otherwise would depend upon the overall ACRs.

13. We now come to the last contention of the learned counsel for the applicant viz; that the award of a minor punishment of 'Censure' cannot stand in the way of promotion. We are entirely in-agreement with the learned counsel that as per the Standing orders of the Delhi Police the minor punishment of 'Censure' cannot be a bar to promotion after a period of six months. This has also been recognised in the guidelines for promotion in the Commissioner of Police Circular dated 23.9.92 which reads as follows:-

(28)

"Officers who have been awarded censures during the last six months with no other punishment may also be allowed to be brought on promotion list provided they do not have any other major punishment. However, the effect of censure by debarring the official for promotion by six months shall continue".

14. While we agree that the penalty of the censure cannot be a bar to promotion after six months, it does not mean that this penalty cannot be taken into account for consideration for determining the suitability of the officer for promotion. This point had also earlier come up before the Tribunal in the case of SI Sajjan Kumar Vs. Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs and Others. The Tribunal had therein held as follows:-

"While it is true that censure is a minor penalty and does not stand as a bar against promotion after six months, nevertheless it is part of the permanent record of an officer and is a relevant factor for considering his suitability and fitness. Censure as any other adverse remarks in the service records will be relevant at the time of consideration for promotion".

On

-15-

15. This observation has also been endorsed by the latest decision of this Tribunal in OA No. 1789/94 decided on 18.11.99. We are also respectfully agree with this conclusion and hold that while censure is not a bar to the promotion as such, it is still a relevant factor for considering the suitability of the officer for promotion.

(29)

16. In the light of the above discussion, we find that the cases of the applicants have to be considered on the basis of their record for determining whether their average entries indicate a 'good' grading. We, therefore, called for the record of the applicants as well as the DPC proceedings. On the basis of our examination of these records we find the position as follows:-

S.I. Jagjit Singh (applicant in OA-759/96)

We find that SI Jagjit Singh No. D-1941 in the ACR or the period 16.7.89 to 31.3.90 has been given 'A' classification which means at least a grading of 'very good'. For the period from 1.4.90 to 31.12.90 he has been given 'A' classification. For the period 30.11.90 to 31.3.91 he has been given 'B' classification. The concluding remarks are that 'he is loyal and sincere worker. Takes interest in the Government job. He is also hard working work. Work and conduct remained very good'.

In view of this position the 'B' classification cannot be recorded as 'average' or 'below average' grading. For the period 1991-92, under the new format his overall grading is 'Average'. He has, however, been shown as impartial and objective, devoted to official work and duty. His overall work and conduct has been described as satisfactory. As regards this ACRs we consider that since an assessment in either way is possible, the matter can be decided by the DPC. For the period 1992-93 the officer has been certified as having Very good moral

Jw

character, Impartial, Helpful, Sincere Worker, Good in Organising capacity, Good in Personality, Good in Power of Command. The overall assessment shows that 'his work and conduct is good'. Therefore, an average grading really ~~means~~ deserves that he has been graded as 'good'. For the period 1992-93 he has been given average grading but overall assessment shows that 'his work and conduct is good'.

30

17. It appears to us, therefore, that the DPC has not given proper consideration to the case and has only gone by the overall grading of 'average'. Considering that there was no provision for the 'good', grading there should have been an overall assessment of the various entries in the ACR of that years. We are, therefore, of the opinion that the case of the officer deserves a review.

18. SI Vishnu Dev Madan (OA 1260/96)

We have seen the proceedings of the DPC and also the ACR records of officer. The officer had been given punishments as follows:-

"1) Censured in 1983 for unnecessarily arresting a person.

2) Censured in 1985 for delaying the registration of case FIR No. 420/85 PS Defence Colony.

3) One year approved service forfeited in 1987 for failing to take action on a complaint.
(D.O.O. 15.10.87)

4) One year approved service forfeited on 6.6.88 for arresting and unnecessary beaten the accused.

5) Censured in 1992 for failed to arrerst the accused in case FIR No. 191/91 PS Geeta Colony.

- 17 -

6) Censured in 1992 for not arresting the accused in case FIR No. 303/91 PS Krishna Nagar".

(31)

19. It has been contended before us by the learned counsel for the applicant that the punishment of Censure awarded to the applicant for the year 1992 has been set aside on account of the cancellation of the cases. Even if that were so, we find that there is a censure against the officer in 1985 and a punishment of stoppage of increment in 1987. He was also censured in 1988. There was also a punishment of forfeiture of one year approved service in 1994 which was reduced to censure on appeal. As we have stated the imposition of penalty of censure can be taken into account for assessing the suitability of the applicant for promotion. The applicant has a good record otherwise. However, in view of the punishments imposed on him, it cannot be said that the case of the applicant has not been properly considered when the DPC determined him to be unfit for promotion. The contention of the learned counsel that ignoring him for promotion on the basis of these punishment constitutes double jeopardy is in our view not correct. While on one hand the punishment ^{is} for acts of omission or commission, they also are indicative of the applicant's suitability for promotion. The punishment of censure has necessarily to be taken into account in the same manner as any adverse remark which may otherwise be recorded.

20. For the aforesaid reasons, we do not consider it that any interference is called for in this case.

On

21. In the light of the above discussion, we allow the OA-759/96. Respondents are directed to consider his case for being brought onto promotion list 'F' with effect from the date of his immediate junior was brought onto that list by means of a detailed and reasoned order.

(32)

22. OA No. 1260/96 is dismissed. No costs.

(R.K. Aheoja)
Member (A)

cc.

(V. Rajagopala Reddy)
Vice-Chairman (J)

Attended
6.6.2010
4.1.2010
C.O.C.W