

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 2538/1989
T.A. No.

199

DATE OF DECISION 31.5.1991.

<u>Dr. Mahabal Ram</u>	<u>Petitioner</u>
<u>Shri Manoj Swarup</u>	<u>Advocate for the Petitioner(s)</u>
<u>Versus</u>	
<u>I.C.A.R. & Ors.</u>	<u>Respondent s</u>
<u>Shri A.K. Sikri & Shri V.K. Rao,</u>	<u>Advocates for the Respondent(s)</u>

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitav Banerji, Chairman.

The Hon'ble Mr. I.K. Rasgotra, Member (A)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ? Yes
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ? No
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? Yes

Amitav Banerji
(AMITAV BANERJI)
CHAIRMAN
31.5.1991.

23

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
DELHI.

O.A. 2538/1989.

Date of decision: May 31, 1991.

Dr. Mahabal Ram ... Applicant.

Vs.

Indian Council of Agriculture
Research & Ors. ... Respondents.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMITAV BANERJI, CHAIRMAN.

HON'BLE MR. I.K. RASGOTRA, MEMBER (A).

For the applicant ... Shri Manoj Swarup,
counsel.

For the respondents ... Shri A.K. Sikri and
Shri V.K. Rao, counsel.

(Judgment of the Bench delivered by Hon'ble
Mr. Justice Amitav Banerji, Chairman).

Dr. Mahabal Ram, a Project Coordinator of All India Coordinated Barley Improvement Project (ICAR), IARI, Regional Station, Karnal (Haryana) filed the above Application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 on 13.12.1989. He prayed that the Office Order dated 23.11.1989 (Appendix D-7) passed by Shri G.C. Srivastava, Secretary, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi transferring him to CSSRI, Karnal as Principal Scientist with immediate effect be quashed and declared as null and void.

After a reply had been filed, the matter came up for hearing before a learned Single Member of the Tribunal. The case was decided by judgment dated 24.1.1990. The operative part of the judgment reads as follows:

" I have absolutely no doubt that the Director General, ICAR, will act in the best interest of scientific research and the country and I will leave the matter entirely to him to post the applicant wherever he thinks his services are likely to yield best results, but the applicant may be allowed to continue in his present post till the end of May, 1990. With these observations, the application is disposed of. There will be no order as to costs."

In other words, the judgment did not give the relief that had been asked for by the applicant. He filed a Special Leave Petition before the Supreme Court. S.L.P. was admitted and Civil Appeal No.2381 of 1991 (arising out of SLP No.6728/90) came up for hearing before a Bench of the Supreme Court.

There were two questions raised in the above Civil Appeal. One was the jurisdiction to dispose of matters coming before the Tribunal by a Single Member Bench and, secondly, a controversy between the parties centring round the order of transfer of the appellant. Their Lordships decided the first question holding that a Single Member is competent to decide matters and gave certain directions. But in respect of the second

aspect of the matter regarding the transfer of the applicant, their Lordships gave a clear direction that they would leave it to the Tribunal to deal with it in the manner indicated. The Supreme Court held:

"In these circumstances, we suggest that the Central Administrative Tribunal shall take up the question relating to transfer of the appellant from the Indian Council of Agricultural Research to Central Soil Salinity Research Institute, Karnal, within two weeks from today so as to have the matter disposed of before 25th May, 1991. The Chairman of the Tribunal, we suggest, shall take personal care to comply with this part of the direction. The appellant has agreed to appear before the Tribunal on 10th May, 1991 and has undertaken to inform Ms. K. Jaiswal that the matter has been posted that day for the purpose. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

The above order was passed on May 3, 1991.

There was no intimation to the Tribunal about the case to be fixed up on the 10 May, 1991. The Tribunal first came to know of this order on the 16th May, 1991, when Shri Manoj Swarup, learned counsel for the applicant appeared with a certified copy of the order which has been obtained on 15.5.1991. It was not possible to list the case on 17.5.1991 as the list for the day had been prepared and it was ordered to be laid before a Division Bench on 21.5.1991, 20.5.91 being a polling day for the Elections in Delhi.

On 21.5.1991, learned counsel for the parties, Shri Manoj Swarup and Shri A.K. Sikri agreed that the case be listed before the Bench on 22.5.1991 at 11 A.M.

for final hearing as item No.1. On account of the assassination of the ex-Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi there was no sitting, the Tribunal was closed on 22.5.1991 and there was no sitting of the Bench. On 23.5.1991, the Bar Association of the Tribunal passed a resolution that they would abstain from doing any work for the day in view of the assassination of the ex-Prime Minister. Members of the Bench were available but the matter could not be taken up. The matter was directed to come up on 24.5.1991. But on that day the funeral of the ex-Prime Minister was scheduled and all Courts and Tribunals in Delhi remained closed, the matter necessarily has to be adjourned to 27.5.1991. On that day the matter was heard at length, for nearly four hours and the orders were reserved.

The Registry was also directed to look for the orders of the Supreme Court which would have sent to the Tribunal. We find from the record that the orders of the Supreme Court dated 3.5.1991 were despatched from the office of the Registrar (Judicial) under D.No.1948/90/SC/SEC-XIV dated 17th/21st May, 1991 and the same was received in the Tribunal on 29.5.1991.

We are conscious of the fact that the directions given in the order of the Supreme Court dated 3.5.1991 to complete the hearing and dispose of the matter before 25.5.1991 could not be complied with in view of the circumstances mentioned above. Had a copy of the order of the Supreme Court been sent to the Registry of the Tribunal forth with, the matter could have been listed on 10.5.1991 as indicated. As it is,

the Tribunal received official intimation from the Registry of the Supreme Court / only on 29.5.1991. The learned counsel for the applicant came with a copy of the order of the supreme court on 16.5.1991, afternoon, and the Tribunal proceeded to hear and dispose of the matter within the time limit but the circumstances were such that this could not be done.

The principal question in this case is whether the transfer of the applicant from the post of Project Coordinator (Barley) IARI Regional Station, Karnal to CSSRI, Karnal was contrary to law, violated the provisions of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution and also mala fide.

The applicant raised the question that he had been a Project Coordinator of All India Coordinated Barley Improvement Project and a plant breeder by specialisation in India. He occupied a special position and the entire research work on the subject would grind to halt if he were transferred. He also emphasised that the seeds which had been collected out of the plants under research can be used up to the end of May this year for germinating a new crop on which experiments were to be conducted. If it was not available for sowing by the end of May, it may go waste, and the entire research on the subject may suffer.

His further emphasis was that he could^{not} be transferred from his present assignment to another where he would not be able to make any contribution as it pertained to a subject other than the one in which he had specialised and guiding research. Lastly, he urged that the Handbook of the ICAR in respect of Agricultural Research Service contained a whole chapter which made it clear that postings, transfers, training and deputation, made provision for mode of transfer, viz., consulting Directors in advance. It is mentioned that while transferring the scientists, consideration should be given to its effect on research programmes so that no programme is disrupted. The Chapter also contained the setting up of a Transfer Committee and issuing orders of transfer at least two months in advance to enable the scientists to make preparations for their movement etc.

Learned counsel for the respondents refuting all the arguments raised by the learned counsel for the applicant pointed out that the service rules make it clear that scientists of the S-3 Category (to which the applicant belongs) are also liable to be transferred anywhere in India under the authority of the I.C.A.R. The tenure at any place or anywhere was 5 years in the first instance renewable for further period of 5 years. The applicant had spent 13 years as Coordinator of the Barley Improvement Project and he was now being transferred to another research station of the I.A.R.I. in Karnal

29

itself. The reason for transfer was that the policy decisions being made by the I.C.A.R. after the report of the High Level Committee that the image of the Barley Project over the last ten years has been reduced and the impact of the barley project has not been felt in the barley growing areas of the country like other crop improvement projects and that it would be better to carry on the research at a place which is predominately barley growing area. Their recommendation was that this project could be continued at Faizabad (U.P).

The applicant had not been transferred to Faizabad but had been kept in Karnal to carry on a project which was connected with the Barley project in respect of the preparation of the land for growing Barley. It was specified in the letter dated 28.8.1990 issued by Shri Kishori Lal, Director (P), ICAR, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi to Dr. N.T. Singh, Director, Central Soil Salinity Research Institute, Karnal that the applicant after he joins as Principal Scientist in CSSRI should be provided with necessary facilities to pursue the work on Barley. It was also argued that being a servant of the I.C.A.R., which was more or less a

al

government organisation, a transfer to any place in India was normal and could be passed. Reference was made to the decisions of the Supreme Court in the case of GUJARAT ELECTRICITY BOARD & ANR. V. ATMARAM SUNGOMAL POSHANI (JT 1989 (3) SC 20) and INDIA V. SHRI H.N. KIRTANIA (JT 1989 (3) SC 131). Lastly, it was urged that the plea of the mala fide could not be assessed as there was no pleadings and even on facts and circumstances, this was not a case of mala fide.

The applicant is aggrieved by the order of transfer from the post of Project Coordinator of All India Coordinated Barley Improvement Project (ICAR), IARI, Regional Station, Karnal to CSSRI, Karnal as Principal Scientist. His grievance is that he had a special status as Project Coordinator of All India Coordinated Barley Improvement Project (B.I.P., in short) and had been leading the research work in producing semi-dwarf high yielding huskless barely variety and part of his research invention has reached the final stage. His contention was that to move him at this stage from the B.I.P. to the CSSRI was unwarranted and uncalled for and had been made to deprive him of the fruits of his research. His further stand was that the research had reached such an advanced stage that to remove him

from the same would mean the end of the project and research work in Barley. He claimed that he could not be transferred like an ordinary government servant from one place to another or from one post to another. Since he was doing a very important research work in a branch in which definite result has been achieved and the matter was at the final stages for approval by the Govt. of India. It would mean a very severe loss to the B.I.P. and the seeds which had been collected in the last harvest and which were to be sown by the end of May would be laid waste, as their germination period would be over.

The first question to be considered is whether the applicant acquired a special status so that ordinary modes of transfer from one post to another or from one station to another was precluded or to be exercised in very special circumstances.

On the question of transfer of a government servant, the Supreme Court had an occasion to make observations and laid down a law in recent two decisions, viz., GUJARAT ELECTRICITY BOARD & ANR (supra) and U.O.I. V. SHRI H.N.KIRTANIA (supra).

In the case of GUJARAT ELECTRICITY BOARD & ANR. (supra), their Lordships observed:

"Transfer of a Government servant appointed to a particular cadre of transferable posts from one place to the other is an incident of service. No Government servant or employee

of Public Undertaking has legal right for being posted at any particular place. Transfer from one place to other is generally a condition of service and the employee has no choice in the matter. Transfer from one place to other is necessary in public interest and efficiency in the public administration. Whenever, a public servant is transferred he must comply with the order but if there be any genuine difficulty in proceeding on transfer it is open to him to make representation to the competent authority for stay, modification or cancellation of the transfer order. If the order of transfer is not stayed, modified or cancelled the concerned public servant must carry out the order of transfer. In the absence of any stay of the transfer order a public servant has no justification to avoid or evade the transfer order merely on the ground of having made a representation, or on the ground of his difficulty in moving from one place to the other. If he fails to proceed on transfer in compliance to the transfer order, he would expose himself to disciplinary action under the relevant Rules..."

In the case of the UNION OF INDIA V. H.N.

KIRTANIA (supra), their Lordships observed:

"The respondent being a Central Government employee held a transferable post and he was liable to be transferred from one place to the other in the country, he has no legal right to insist for his posting at Calcutta or at any other place of his choice.... Transfer of a public servant made on administrative grounds or in public interest should not be interfered with unless there are strong and pressing grounds rendering the transfer order illegal on the ground of violation of statutory rules or on ground of mala fides."

The above decisions are binding on all Courts and Tribunals throughout India under Art. 141 of the

Constitution.

At this stage it would be necessary to refer to the letter of appointment of the applicant in the I.C.A.R. dated 24th June, 1976. He was appointed as Scientist Grade S-3 in Agricultural Research Service. Term Nos.

(iv), (v) and (vi) are as follows:

- (iv) He will be initially posted to work as Project Coordinator (Barley) with the headquarters at the Haryana Agricultural University, Hissar, but as a member of the Service, he will be liable to be posted to any Grade S-3 assignment anywhere in India.
- (v) He may be required to serve in a backward or less developed areas of the country for such period as may be decided by the Controlling Authority.
- (vi) It will be open to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research to depute him to work in the post under the Central or State Government, Agricultural Universities or elsewhere (including assignments abroad) for specific periods.

The above makes it clear that he can be transferred anywhere in India and his duration in any project was also to be controlled by the I.C.A.R. Admittedly, the applicant was posted as Project Coordinator Barley Project for over 10 years. If the authorities in the I.C.A.R. felt that his transfer was necessary for another assignment, it could be ordered also.

It is not in dispute that the applicant was holding a transferable post. Under the conditions of service applicable to him, he was liable to be transferred and posted at any place within India. He had no legal or statutory right for being posted at one particular place of his choice or in one particular post.

Reference was made to 4 letters- Annexures T, U, V and W to Supplementary Affidavit filing additional documents by the applicant. Shri N.T. Singh, Director, CSSRI, Karnal wrote letters to secretary, ICAR, (Annexure 'T'), Deputy Director General (CS), ICAR (Annexures 'U', 'V'), Under secretary (K), ICAR (Annexure 'V') stating that the posting of Dr. Mahabal Ram in the CSSRI would be a wastage of experience and talent of the Scientist. " This could lead to his frustration and harm the Institute research activities".

The matter was considered by the I.C.A.R. and replied by a letter dated 28.8.1990 vide Annexure 'H' to the supplementary Affidavit. In that letter it was stated:

"The suitability of Dr. Mahabal Ram to work at CSSRI, Karnal on the aspects of evolving soil tolerant Barley variety was considered at the level of the Director General duly keeping in view the fact that Barley is one of the important crops on which the CSSRI has been working for the last 10 years. It was therefore decided that in the interest of Barley research as also the concerned Scientist, the CSSRI, Karnal would be the best location.

Therefore, it is requested that necessary facilities may be provided to Dr. Mahabal Ram after he joins as Principal Scientist at your Institute to pursue the work on Barley. If you consider appropriate to allot him some other projects, the Council has no objection. As Dr. Mahabal Ram is a Plant Breeder, he may be able to work on any other crop because the principles of the crop improvement from crop to crop not differ substantially."

It is, therefore, to be noticed that he was to persue the work on Barley and especially on the aspects of evolving soil tolerant Barley variety. Thus, it was not a case of working on a project apart from Barley. The above letter makes it clear the nature of assignment that the applicant was given at CSSRI. Thus, the applicant is to continue his research on Barley in the context of soil tolerance, which only gives an added dimension to the Barley development in India.

In the present case, the applicant was accorded the status of Project Coordinator but he was Scientist 3 (S-3). It is equivalent to the post of Principal Scientific Officer. The pay of the two posts, viz., one which he was keeping and the second to which he was ordered to be transferred carry the same pay and, in our opinion, more or less, the same responsibilities. It appears that the applicant was chosen in the interest of Barley and according to Director(P)'s letter dated 28.8.90,

ag

36

CSSRI was a proper place to conduct the research. In our opinion, there was no loss of status of the applicant in being posted in CSSRI where he was to lead the research connected with the growth of Barley in respect of suitable soil. His status cannot be compared to that of a Principal of a college as in the case of VICE-CHANCELLOR, L.N. MITHILA UNIVERSITY V. DAYANAND JHA (supra). He has the status of Principal Scientist Category S.3 and there was no loss of rank or status upon his transfer to the CSSRI.

Learned counsel for the applicant referred to Chapter 5 of the Handbook on Agricultural Research Service of the ICAR which relates to postings, transfers, training and deputation. The heading 'TRANSFERS' contains the following:

" All-India Service Liability.

A member of the A.R.S. is liable to transfer to any place in India. He is also required to serve a minimum period of time in a backward or comparatively less developed area of the country.

The transfers will be made in the following circumstances:

- (i) to correct imbalance in the cadre strength of scientists in various disciplines at different institutes and also within an Institute including regional stations,
 - (ii) to fill positions in high priority projects, direct recruitment to which through the Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board may result in delay, in the implementation of programmes,
 - (iii) to utilize the experience of scientists in appropriate fields,
- 67

- (iv) to post scientists in backward or comparatively less developed areas in accordance with the provisions of Rule 20(2) of the A.R.S. rules and
- (v) for administrative reasons.

TENURE OF POSTING

The tenure of posting will normally be 5 years in the first group, 4 years in the second group and 3 years in the third group....

MODE OF TRANSFER

"..... In case of inter-institutional transfer, Directors should be consulted/informed in advance. While transferring the scientists, consideration should be given to its effect on research programmes so that no programme is disrupted. Transfer not of a routine nature according to pattern but on administrative/disciplinary grounds should be ordered by the Directors in the Centres/stations under them after getting the prior approval of the D.G., ICAR."

On the basis of the above, it was argued that where inter-institutional transfer is concerned, the Director had to be consulted and informed in advance. Great emphasis was laid on the sentence "While transferring the scientists, consideration should be given to its effect on research programmes so that no programme is disrupted." The applicant was doing semi-dwarf, high yielding huskless barley variety and a part of his research invention has reached the final stage. This research will be impaired because of the transfer. All the work done on the research will come to an end.

The answer of the respondents was that a High Level Committee had valued the work done and had come

Q2

to the conclusion that the work on research of Barley should be continued in an area where Barley was grown over large area. The Committee recommended that the research work be transferred to Acharya Narenderdev Agricultural College, Faizabad. It was not that the research programme was abandoned. It was to be carried on at Faizabad. It was stated on behalf of the applicant that he would have no grievance if he was transferred to carry on the work on Barley at Faizabad. But he was transferred to the CSSRI to curtail his work and to curtail the research work on Barley.

It is evident from the above that the research work on Barley was not to be continued in Karnal but was to be carried on at Faizabad (U.P), the applicant was not transferred to Faizabad for according to the authorities, they found the applicant/^asuitable place at Karnal itself to carry on research in CSSRI in respect of the soil which would favour the growth of the semi-dwarf high yielding huskless barley variety.

It has already been noticed in the letter dated 28.8.1990 of the Director (P), ICAR that the applicant was to work on a subject which was analogous to the growth of a particular variety on barley. He had specialised as a plant breeder and his services could be utilised for other crop as well. Further, he had devoted more than 10 years in the growth of Barley and there was no legal bar in his being transferred to do research

a

for any other plan as decided by the Directors of the ICAR. As a matter of fact, it goes without saying that in an organisation which does primarily research work, the Head of the Institution has to decide as to what work is necessary and what emphasis should be given to each field of study or research. The deployment of the personnel, most of whom are highly rated scientists of proven ability rests with the Directors of the institutes rather than to be determined at the will of the Scientists themselves.

The Handbook of the ICAR Agricultural Research Service does not contain any rules which govern the service of the applicant but is a guideline only. Too much emphasis cannot be given to the contents thereof. The contents of the Handbook, particularly, Chapter 5 had to be taken as guidelines and nothing more. Even under the guidelines, a scientist employed in the ICAR is liable to be transferred anywhere in India. This is not disputed. Since the applicant's service envisage placement of his service anywhere in India including inter-institutional transfer controlled by the I.C.A.R.

Learned counsel for the applicant had cited the case of B.S. MINHAS V. INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE AND OTHERS ((1983) 4 SCC 582) where their Lordships held that bye-laws framed for procedural fairness, even if not having statutory force, are binding. It was

88

argued in that case that bye-laws not having the force of statute, non-compliance with its requirement cannot in any way affect the appointment of respondent No.4 as the Director of respondent No.1. Learned counsel for applicant contended that assuming that the bye-law is not statutory, even then the respondent No.1 was bound to comply with it.

Reference was made to the case of RAMANA DAYARAM SHETTY

V. INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY OF INDIA (AIR 1979

SC 1628). The Division Bench of the Supreme Court held:

"In view of the pronouncement of this Court on the point it must be held to be obligatory on the part of respondent No.1 to follow the bye-laws, if the bye-laws have been framed for the conduct of its affairs to avoid arbitrariness. Respondent No.1 cannot, therefore, escape the liability for not following the procedure prescribed by bye-law 2. "

We are of the view that the above principle would not be applicable in the present case. What we have before us in the Handbook is not even the bye-laws. Nevertheless, we think that what is contained in the Handbook is in the nature of guidelines and these have to be followed as far as possible. It is not shown in the present case that the guidelines have been disregarded. The question whether the transfer of the applicant would have effect on the research programme of the applicant is also to be viewed in the light of the policy decision of the ICAR. If the latter decides to curtail or change the site of the research on a particular project, that cannot be challenged by a scientist in a Court of law or this Tribunal.

a

Therefore, keeping in view the policy decisions of the ICAR to transfer the research of Barley to Faizabad in U.P. and to place the applicant to do some connected research work on Barley in respect of the soil cannot be said to be contrary to the guidelines.

We, therefore, conclude that the applicant did not enjoy any special status which would rule out the transfer applicable to officers working on all-India basis. The applicant was of a status of the Principal Scientist, the guidelines indicated that they would not be transferred casually but after a certain duration. The clause (v) under the heading 'Transfer' made it clear that the transfer can be made at any time for administrative reasons. That is, however, not the case.

The applicant had worked in this particular project for more than 10 years and the authorities concerned were following the recommendations of the High Level Committee to transfer the applicant to CSSRI for doing some further research in connected subject. We do not see any illegality.

The applicant has criticised the formation and the constituents of the High Level Committee saying that some of its members were junior to him and were not men of repute or status. We need not go into this question at all. A High Level Committee is a committee which has certain overriding powers. The Committee

99

considered the research work and was of the view that the research work in Barley had to be shifted from Karnal to Faizabad. Consequently, the research work on ^{IARI} Barley at Karnal is likely to be wound up. The decision of the High Level Committee was adopted by the ICAR as a policy decision. It is not open to a scientist to challenge the policy decision of the ICAR. We therefore, do not attach any importance to this aspect of the matter.

We now come to the question of mala fides. There is no concrete allegations of mala fides on the part of the respondents. It is not stated as to what mala fides acts were done against the applicant, nor the persons who were acting as such were named.

In the case of E.P. ROYAPPA V. STATE OF TAMIL NADU AND ANOTHER (AIR 1974 SC 555), a Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court laid down that the burden of establishing mala fides is very heavy on the person who alleges it. The allegations of mala fides are often more easily made than proved, and the very seriousness of such allegations demands proof of a high order of credibility.

Before we conclude, we may refer to an argument raised by the learned counsel for the applicant quoting a passage from the case of P.K. RAMACHANDRA IYER & ORS. V. UNION OF INDIA & ORS ((1984) 2 SCR 200 at page 221).

Reference was made to the following passage:


"Two decades thereafter we are constrained to note that the things have not improved at all. The ICAR and the Institutes seem to be so backward looking in their approach to the members of the staff that as late as in 1983 considerable time of this Court was frankly wasted in disposing of the preliminary objection on behalf of the ICAR that it is not amenable to this Court's writ jurisdiction which would imply that they have skeletons to hide and shun their exposure to the Court's examination of the internal affairs."


Reference was also made to a committee under the Chairmanship of Shri P.B. Gajendragadkar, retired Chief Justice of India and Vice-Chancellor, University of Bombay and at the relevant time Chairman, Law Commission with wide terms of reference inter alia to enquire into the recruitment policies of ICAR and to review the recruitment and personnel policies of ICAR, Institutes and Centres working under it and to suggest measures for their improvement. This was a judgment delivered in 1984 in respect of the working of the ICAR. That took place prior to the delivery of the judgment. This will have no relevance in the present case. There is nothing in the pleadings to suggest that the ICAR has continued in a similar situation.

Having given the matter our deep consideration, we come to the conclusion that the transfer order passed against the applicant was neither mala fide nor

41

offended any provision of law; nor could be termed
in breach of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution.
We are, therefore, of the view that this O.A. has no
merits and must fail. We accordingly dismiss it but
in the circumstances direct the parties to bear their
own costs.


(I.K. RASGOTRA)
MEMBER (A)
31.5.1991.


31.5.91
(AMITAV BANERJI)
CHAIRMAN
31.5.1991.

SKS