

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, N.Delhi
....

O.A. No. 1143/94
O.A. No. 1194/94
O.A. No. 776/94
O.A. No. 1201/94
O.A. No. 1262/94
O.A. No. 1688/94

New Delhi, this 3rd Day of March, 1995.

HON'BLE SHRI J.P. SHARMA, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE SHRI B.K. SINGH, MEMBER (A)

OA No. 1143/94.

Shri V.K.Puri s/o
Shri H.L.Puri,
Executive Engineer,
C.P.W.D., Vigilance Unit,
Director General of Works,
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
Resident of C-5/A 270,
JanakPuri, New Delhi.

Applicant

(By Shri Sohan Lal, Advocate)

Versus

1. Union of India through its

(a) Secretary,
Ministry of Urban Development,
Government of India,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi- 110 011.

(b) Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel,
Public Grievances & Pensions,
North Block, New Delhi- 110 001.

2. Director General of Works,
Central Public Works Department,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi-110 001-

Respondent

(By Shri K.C.Sharma, Advocate)

O.A.No. 1194/94

Shri Satish Chandra,
s/o Shri (Late) Shri G.D.Garg,
EE CPWD, Delhi Administration,
MSO Building, I.P.Estate,
IIND a 147, Nehru Nagar,
Ghaziabad.

Applicant

(By Shri Sohan Lal, Advocate)

Versus

...2...

Union of India through its,

(a) Secretary,
Ministry of Urban Development,
Government of India,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi- 110 001.

(b) Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel,
Public Grievances & Pensions,
North Block,
New Delhi- 110 001.

Director General of Works,
Central Public Works Department,
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi- 110 001.

(By Shri K.C. Sharma, Advocate)

Respondents.

No. 716/94.

Shri V.C. Sighal s/o
Late Shri Babu Ram
Retired Executive Engineer (Civil),
C.P.W.D.

Flat of C/27, Vivek Vihar,
-I, Shahdara,
New Delhi- 110 095.

(By Shri Sehan Lal, Advocate)

Applicant

Versus

Union of India through its

(a) Secretary,
Ministry of Urban Development,
Govt. of India,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi- 110 001.

(b) Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel,
Public Grievances & Pensions,
North Block,
New Delhi- 110 001.

Director General of Works,
Central Public Works Department,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi- 110 001.

(By Shri K.C. Sharma, Advocate)

Respondents

No. 1201/94.

M. Aggarwal s/o
Late Shri Lal Bahadur Singh,
7, South Moti Bagh,
K Pura, New Delhi- 110 017.

(By Shri Sehan Lal, Advocate)

Applicant

Versus

....3...

1. Union of India through, its

(a) Secretary,
Ministry of Urban Development,
Govt. of India,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi- 110 001.

(b) Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel,
Public Grievances & Pensions,
North Block,
New Delhi- 110 001.

2. Director General of Works,
Central Public Works Department,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi- 110 011.

Respondents.

(by Shri M.M. Sudan, Advocate)

D.A. 1262/94.

Shri A.K. Aggarwal,
S/o Late Shri Y.P. Aggarwal,
R/O 92, Navyug Market,
Ghaziabad (U.P.).
Working as Executive Engineer,
C.P.W.D. (Vigilance) Unit,
O/O Director General of Works,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi.

Applicant

(By Shri Sohan Lal, Advocate)

Versus

1. Union of India through its

(a) Secretary,
Ministry of Urban Development,
Government of India,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi- 110 011.

(b) Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel,
Public Grievances & Pensions,
North Block,
New Delhi- 110 001.

2. Director General of Works,
Central Public Works Department,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi- 110 011.

Respondents

(By Shri M.M. Sudan, Advocate)

Contd....

OA No. 1688/94.

R.K. Vashist
Age 57 Years S/o Late Shri Balbir Singh,
Executive Engineer
PWD Divn. No. XXI (MCTD)
Eashwar Nagar,
Delhi-Mathura Road,
New Delhi.

R/o C-69, Naraina Vihar,
New Delhi - 110 028.

Applicant

(By Nene)

Versus

Union of India through
the Director General (Works),
Central Public Works Department,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi - 110 011.

Respondents.

(By Shri R.K. Gupta, Advocate)

J U D G E M E N T (O R A L)

Hon'ble Shri J.P. Sharma, Member (J)

All the applicants are serving as Executive Engineer except Shri V.C. Singhal who has retired on superannuation on 31.1.1992 and Shri R.K. Vashist who retired during pendency of this Application. The applicants i.e. Executive Engineers were promoted from the post of Asstt. Engineer on different dates but their promotion was termed as ad-hoc and they have not yet been regularised in their appointment on regular basis. While giving them promotion to the post of Executive Engineer on different dates mentioned hereunder, all the applicants were given the benefits of fixation of pay under FR 22(c) now FR 22(a) (1) particularly in view of the fact that the responsibilities and duties of promotion have to be shared by them carrying higher responsibility and discharge of duties. The grievance of the applicants in all the cases is common i.e. while fixing their

....2..

....5...

pay under the said FR-22-C, their options for date of increment has not been considered by the respondents. The applicants have given different dates of fixation of their pay on the date of increment under FR 22(c), a chart of the same is given below:-

<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Date of Promotion</u>	<u>Date of next increment</u>
V.C.Singhal	20.11.1987	1.1.1988
V.K.Puri	27.11.1992	1.1.1993
Satish Chandra	1.12.1992	1.1.1993
A.K.Aggarwal	6.7.1992	1.1.1993
M.K.Aggarwal	19.11.1990	1.12.1990
R.K.Vashishtha	20.8.1991	1.8.1992

2. The applicants have filed separate original applications but the relief claimed by them in all the applications is almost the same except in O.A. No. 73/94 by Shri V.C.Singhal (Retd.) who has also claimed retirement benefits. The relief claimed in the O.A. No. 776/94 is taken as an example and the said relief was subsequently amended by the applicants. The amended relief is quoted below:-

8. Relief Sought:

- (a) the O.M. dated 8.2.1994 may please be declared illegal and void to the extent it denies the benefit of the judgement in O.A. No. 2947 of 91 in Shri D.V.Singh v/s Union of India and others.
- (b) To direct the respondents to give the benefit of the judgement of this Hon'ble Tribunal in O.A. No. 2947/91 Shri D.V.Singh v/s Union of India & Others delivered on 26.4.1993.
- (c) To direct the respondents to fix the pay of the applicant under FR 22(a)(i) w.e.f. 21.11.1987 to 31.12.1987 as per O.M. Dated 9.11.1987.
- (d) To direct the respondents to fix the pay of the applicant under FR 22(c) w.e.f. 1.1.1988 as per O.M. dated 9.11.1987 and as per option of the applicant dated 26.11.1987 as fixed by the respondents vide order dated 22.3.1988 and to pay these arrears.

....5....

6

...6...

- (e) To direct the respondents to give the consequential benefits on his retirement on 31.1.1992 of his pay fixed in terms of the order of the Hon'ble Tribunal in O.A. No. 2947/91 for retirement benefits such as pension, gratuity, leave salary and commutation of pension etc.
- (f) To direct the respondents to pay the interest at market rate @ 18% per annum on the arrears of pay and allowances.
- (g) To direct the respondents to pay the interest at market rate @ 18% per annum on the arrears of the retirement benefit such as pension, gratuity, leave salary and commutation of pay etc. w.e.f. 31.1.1992.
- (h) Cost of the application be awarded to the applicant.
- (i) To pass such orders or further orders as the Hon'ble Tribunal deems fit & proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

In O.A. No. 1688/91 the said amendment has not been prayed

On notice the respondents contested these applications

in their reply have taken the stand that the applicants' appointments have not yet been regularised in their appointments and they are holding the post of Executive Engineer on a hoc basis and

by G.O. dated 2.2.1985 and G.O. dated 28.1.85

issued by Deptt. of Personnel & Training and encased with the

and counter-claims down that objection for fixation of pay on the

date of next increment is determined by the Deptt. in the

lower grade of the feeder post can be allowed, indirectly,

it is argued that only on the regular promotion the benefit

of giving option can be claimed by the promotee and not

otherwise. The learned counsel for the respondents have also

referred to G.O. dated 9.11.1987. In their reply filed

by respondents etc. and Original Application separately

it is stated that so far promotion to the grade

of Executive Engineer (Civil) is concerned from 1980-1994

(31st March, 1994) have been regularised and a seniority list

of Executive Engineer (Civil) issued on 28th October, 1994,

that the Assistant Engineer (Civil) appointed during 1967-68

have so far been included in the seniority list of regularly

appointed Executive Engineers. None of the applicants who have

separately filed the application in the reply to the respective

Original Applications, it is stated that they were appointed

as Assistant Engineer (Civil) in C.P.W.D. and have been subse-

quently given ad-hoc promotion to the post of Executive Engineer

have not yet been regularised. In view of the above, the pay of

the applicants have separately been fixed in accordance with the

Govt. orders applicable to the Govt. servants. There is no discrim-

ination or any hostile intention towards the applicants. In

his ad-hoc appointment is regularised by the duly consti-

uted P.C. and his ad-hoc appointment is followed by regular

appointment any day, the applicant would get the right

to exercise option from the date of initial appointment/

and his promotion to the grade of Executive Engineer. The applicants,

therefore, as stated by the respondents, can wait the outcome

of the regularisation process till they are appointed on regular

basis in the grade of Executive Engineer by the duly constituted

request for exercising option to get his pay fixed is

totally unjustified and untenable, in view of the various

referred to in the counter and annexed along with it. Detailing

further arguments in reply to the original application, the

respondents have stated that the delay was because of

the agency in the service as certain litigation was pending in

the Apex Court for the determination of the inter-cas seniority

in the grade of Assistant Engineer and till that matter is

finally decided the seniority list could not be finally

revised and re-fixed but now the decision has arrived at have and the respondents/undertaken the process of re-fixing and revising the seniority list.

4. The applicants have also filed the rejoinder in all the cases separately and they have re-iterated their contentions as already raised in the Original Applications.

5. We have heard the learned counsel for the applicant Shri Sohan Lal. Shri K.N.R. Pillai is not present. As his case

is covered by the arguments of Shri Sohan Lal so we have taken into consideration the help of Shri Sohan Lal also in

his case. We have heard Shri K.C. Sharma, M.K. Gupta and M.M. Sudan/for the respondents at greater length. The main question

in this case is that the promotion to the post of Executive Engineer has been termed as ad-hoc. The contention of the

respondents' counsel is by virtue of the OM of dated 8.2.63 referred to above, option cannot be exercised for fixation

of pay on the date of increment by ad-hoc promotees. This contention of the respondents' counsel is duly illustrated

in the annexed annexure of DePAT. However, the point in issue is whether the applicants are actually holding the regular

vacancies of longer duration or are working in certain arrangements where the vacancies are short-lived. It is also to be

seen whether they have cleared the pre-appointment test prescribed for promotion to the higher post of Executive

Engineer or not. When considering the individual case of these

applicants, it is not disputed that the applicants have been cleared by a Screening Committee though it cannot be equated with a regularly constituted D.P.C. according to the Recruitment Rules. In view of these, it is fervently argued by the respondents' counsel that if the applicants are considered by the D.P.C. any of them may not be given regularisation, may be passed over or may get regularised in his appointment from the initial date of ad-hoc promotion to the post of Executive Engineer. It is also a fact that DPC was not constituted since all these years. The respondents have a justifiable excuse because unless the seniority of the Assistant Engineer is finally settled by the Apex Court the DPC has to consider persons on the basis of expected seniority ^{at} list for taking into account/persons who will fall within the zone of consideration viz-a-viz the number of vacancies for the relevant year. This fact apart, if the respondents have chosen to give ad-hoc promotions and have also given the benefit of fixation of pay under FR 22(c) now FR 22(e)(1) can they deny the promotees the benefit of option or not. While going to the OM of January, 1985 para 4 deals with the fact that no option can be allowed in the case of ad-hoc promotion but immediately below this there is para 5 which lays down that if the benefit of FR 22(c) i.e. FR 22(4) (i) is given then option can also be allowed. Learned counsel Shri K.C.Sharma for the respondents emphatically asserted that it is to be read with para 4 and do not itself has to be read in isolation. However, while going through the

Scheme of the aforesaid O.M. each and every paragraph

deals with the matter separately and one cannot read alongwith

other obviously because if it is taken to be a part of the

other para then the scheme would have cleared the same or

must have clarified in a subsequent O.M. We, therefore, are

fortified in our view by two decisions of our own Tribunal,

one is in the case of Piplani reported in AIR 1987 (1) CAT

253 and the other in the case of D.V.Singh Vs. Union of India

in O.A. No. 2947/91 decided on 26th April, 1993. The later

case is of a Single Bench but the former case is of a Division

Bench. Learned counsel Shri M.K.Gupta for the respondents has

rightly pointed out that the applicant in the case of Piplani

was a promotee earlier to the issue of O.M. of 1983 and O.M.

of 1983 was not, therefore, consider point of time.

Regarding the decision of the case of D.V.Singh, the

learned counsel for the respondents pointed out that there is

no discussion of this O.M. including that of 11.11.1987 and as

such this judgement should be taken as judgement per incuriam

We have considered these aspects in the light of the arguments

advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant. The ratio

in the case of D.V.Singh is that if ad-hoc promotion continues

for years together and thus concluded by the learned counsel for

the respondents Shri M.K.Gupta that while revising the seniority

list and giving various berth in that seniority list of Assistant

Engineer, if the position of any of that officers is changed

then that officer will not suffer reversion though may be

working on the post of Assistant Engineer on ad-hoc basis.

6. It is further clarified in the manner that the process of revision of seniority list is undergoing and so long there exists a vacancy either of the year for which DPC is held or for a subsequent year and a person is ultimately promoted though subsequently his berth in the seniority list may change but he may not face reversion.

7. Now all these lead to the result that this initial promotion to the post of Assistant Engineer have been continuing for about 3 or 4 years without any break though they have not yet been regularized as the process of the regularisation has taken place upto the year 1967-68 and applicant Shri V.C. Singhal is of 1976 batch and the other applicants are of different years but they are of 1979 batch.

8. In the case of Patwardhan reported in 1977(SC) page 2157 AIR, the matter of seniority of Engineers were considered and in this case the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has considered about the duration of vacancies whether they are of long term or of short duration. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in that case held that if the vacancies are of one year or more then the vacancies are termed as vacancy of longer duration. Here, in this case, these applicants are working as Assistant Engineer on ad-hoc basis for more than three years and these vacancies, therefore, cannot be termed as vacancies of stop gap arrangement or of transitory in nature. The respondents too have conceded fairly that the ad-hoc appointments have been given on regular vacancies but because of pendency of litigation of seniority in the Apex

Court, the regularly constituted D.P.C. has not considered their

cases and only by a Departmental Screening Committee, the promotion have been effected. If the respondent is considered as sufficient, their outlook though it may amount to promotion not in accordance with the rules but at the same time these promotions are when all eligible persons have been considered and that the vacancies are regular and are of longer duration. In such an eventuality, the term ad-hoc attached to the promotion of these applicants loses the significance. They, for all purposes, are holder of regular post of longer duration. It may be that subsequently a regular D.O.C., if constituted, will consider them on the basis of their performance and may regularise them or in the event they are not found fit may revert them to their substantive post. If they are reverted to the substantive post the benefit of the pay which they have claimed will no longer exist. If they are regularised on their post the benefit of pay will continue and their regularisation will date back to their initial date of appointment. However, it is made clear that this benefit will not in any way confer them any right of seniority which will be governed solely on the date of regularisation and as per the norms laid down in the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. Here, we are only considering for giving the benefit of option while promoting the applicants to the higher responsible post of Executive Engineer.

9. A situation may also arise that the persons may have to be reverted and if any of the applicants are reverted subsequently or if not regularised then the benefit which will accrue to them

by this Judgement have to be rescinded because the applicants themselves are not awaiting the result of their regularisation and have come before this Tribunal for awarding of benefit and to an order of regularisation in such cases, This is a specific condition which is being observed in this order for giving the benefit to the applicants.

10. Now, considering the case of the applicants, since the ad-hoc promotion continues without break and their cases are covered by two decided cases (supra) and also by OM of Feb., 1983 dated 14.2.83, the applicants shall be entitled to their options which they will be given within three months from the date of this order and respondents, in turn, will give fixation of pay to the applicants if they had not already given to the applicants, within three months thereafter. Those applicants who have already retired from service, it has been pointed out during the course of arguments that Sh. V.C. Singhal applicant in OA No. 776/94 and Sh. R.K. Jashisht applicant in OA No. 1007/94 have since been re-joined, they will be entitled to re-fixation of their retirement benefit also. The applications are allowed with the following directions:-

- (a) The applicants shall give their date of option for grant of next increment for fixation of pay under FR 22(c)/FR 22(a)(1) to the respondents within three months from today and the respondents shall consider the same and revise their pay from the date of their initial appointment to the post of Executive Engineer, if not already fixed, taking into account the option they have preferred

for fixation of pay on the date of increment and on the date of promotion and on the basis of next increment in the feeder grade. The applicants, by virtue of this re-fixation of pay, shall be entitled to the arrears of pay due to them during all the years.

- (b) In case any of the applicants except those who have retired are not regularised and that they face a reversion or in any manner do not keep their seniority intact then the benefit given to them shall be reconsidered by the respondents after due notice to them and hearing them on that account, if occasion arises may be withdrawn.
- (c) Those who have retired from service i.e. Shri V.C. Singhal and Shri R.K. Vashishth, will also be given the benefit referred to above in para (a) and they will also be given the benefit of fixation of pay in the revised pensionary benefits etc. on the basis of their retirement benefits. In that circumstances of the case, the parties shall bear their own costs. A copy of this Judgement shall be placed in each of the files of the above mentioned six cases.

B
B.K. SINGH)
MEMBER (A)

nka/

Attested

KSR
2/3/95 Cope-III

Jonman
(J.P. SHARMA)
MEMBER (J)

917